

NOV 23 '45

# THE MONTH

SEPT.-OCT., 1945

Vol. CLXXXI

EIGHTY-SECOND YEAR

No. 947

## CONTENTS

	Page
COMMENTS.....	By the Editor 289
ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA.....	By Rt. Rev. Mgr. R. A. Knox 305
EUROPE—A SOCIETY OF PEOPLES.....	By Christopher Dawson 309
THE LAST SUPPER AND ITS LITURGICAL SHAPE IN HISTORY	
	By Maurice Bévenot 317
THE ELECTION VICTORY OF THE LABOUR PARTY AND	
LATIN AMERICA.....	By Richard Pattee 324
THE LOVE OF GOD.....	By R. H. J. Steuart 331
AN ARCHBISHOP LOOKS AT INDIA ..	By Most Rev. T. Roberts, S.J. 335
THE RETURN OF ST. JOAN ( <i>Verwe</i> ).....	By Mary Winter Were 344
MISCELLANEA .....	339
I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.	
A Character of the French Revolution.	
II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES.	
REVIEWS .....	346
1.—(1) <i>Les Théories Économiques Contemporaines</i> . By Robert Kothén; (2) <i>Les Écoles Sociologiques</i> . By Robert Kothén. (3) <i>Principes d'Éducation Populaire</i> . By Robert Kothén. 2.— <i>A Realistic Philosophy</i> . By K. F. Reinhardt. 3.—(1) <i>Suicide Bent</i> . By David Goldstein, I.L.D. (2) <i>The Registrar General's Statistical Review of England and Wales for the Year 1940</i> . Part II. H.M. Stationery Office. 4.—(1) <i>The Problem of Austria</i> . By E. J. Passant. Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs. No. 72. (2) <i>Austria</i> . By "Pannonius" Sword of the Spirit International Problems Series. 5.— <i>The War and the Vatican</i> . By Camille Cianfarra. 6.— <i>L'Unité du Christ</i> . By Paul Galtier, S.J.	

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.

43 Albert Drive, London, S.W.19

EDITORIAL OFFICES :

114 Mount Street, London, W.1

MANAGER'S ADDRESS :

Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15, to which Annual Subscriptions,  
13s. post free (U.S.A. \$3.25), should be sent.

TWO SHILLINGS NET

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

THE WESTMINSTER VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. *A New Translation from the Original Greek and Hebrew Texts.* GENERAL EDITORS: The Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., Professor of Fundamental Theology at Heythrop College, Oxon, and The Rev. John Murray, S.J., Editor of "The Month."

---

## THE NEW TESTAMENT IN FOUR VOLUMES

---

**VOLUME I—CONTENTS:** THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW—THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK—THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE, BY THE VERY REV. JOSEPH DEAN, D.D., PH.D. CHRONOLOGY AND HARMONY OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. 8VO. CLOTH, 10S. 6D. NET.

**VOLUME II—CONTENTS:** THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN, BY THE REV. W. S. REILLY, S.S., S.T.D. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. 8VO. CLOTH, 10S. 6D. NET.

**VOLUME III—CONTENTS:** THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J., AND THE REV. JOSEPH KEATING, S.J. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS, BY THE REV. ALEXANDER KEOGH, S.J. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, BY THE REV. CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. THE EPISTLES OF THE CAPTIVITY. EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS, BY THE REV. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. PHILEMON AND PHILIPPIANS, BY THE MOST REV. ALBAN GOODIER, S.J. 8VO. CLOTH, 10S. 6D. NET.

**VOLUME IV—CONTENTS:** THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, BY THE REV. PATRICK BOYLAN, D.LITT., D.D. THE PASTORAL AND JOHANNINE EPISTLES; THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN, BY THE REV. FRANCIS GIGOT, S.T.D. THE EPISTLES OF SS. JAMES, PETER, JUDE, BY THE REV. W. H. KENT, O.S.C. 8VO. CLOTH, 8S. 6D. NET.

---

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.,  
43 ALBERT DRIVE, LONDON, S.W.19

# THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXXI

SEPT.-OCT., 1945

No. 947

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS

### The Significance of London

**L**ONDON has been, and is to be, the centre of vitally important meetings. Throughout September it played host to the Council of Foreign Ministers. In December it will be the setting for the first meeting of the Constituent Assembly of the New World Organization. London has many claims to fulfil this exalted rôle. It was the main centre from which there radiated the efforts of the Western Allies that resulted in the defeat and collapse of Germany, and its refusal to break under savage enemy air attacks was every bit as decisive in the West as was in the East the stubborn resistance of the Russians at Stalingrad. And quite apart from these temporary titles, London ought to provide a very suitable bridge between the great non-European powers, in their work for the reconstruction of Europe. For London is at once a European and a non-European city just as Britain is, at one and the same time, a European and a non-European Power. Britain is linked with Europe ; its security and prosperity depend, in large measure, upon the security and prosperity of the Continent ; if Continental countries remain for long in misery and chaos, the consequences for Britain will be very serious indeed. Yet it must be admitted that the results of the Foreign Ministers' meetings in London have not been a good augury for the December meeting of the Constituent Assembly. For all practical purposes, no important decisions have been reached ; the peace treaties with Italy and other countries in the orbit of the Axis have been relegated to sub-committees for further consideration ; the division between Western and Eastern, i.e. Russian-occupied, Europe has been intensified, which is only another way of saying that the points of view of Britain, the United States and France on the one hand, and Russia, on the other hand, are seen to be as divergent as ever, and in certain cases are fundamentally opposed.

### The First Great Problem

**T**HE first great problem in Europe is not political but economic ; is not, for example, where the boundary line shall be drawn between Italy and Yugoslavia to the east of Trieste but how the peoples, both of Italy and of Yugoslavia, can be helped back to tolerable and decent conditions of existence. Distress and misery always follow in the wake of war, and this truth is grimly evident to-day when hundreds

of cities lie in ruins, and transport systems on the Continent have been most severely damaged and dislocated. There are occasional reports of "plenty" from fortunate corners like Denmark but these are only scanty lights twinkling in a drear desert of scarcity and privation; in fact, these scanty lights serve only to accentuate the desert and darkness out of which they shine. The work of U.N.R.R.A. and its associated voluntary Relief Societies is magnificent, but it cannot hope by itself to solve the ghastly problem. We had better face the appalling facts: a great number of the people of Europe will be facing famine during the coming winter; in all human probability, millions may succumb to under-nourishment and inhuman conditions of life as part of the aftermath of war. Under these dreadful circumstances, it becomes doubly important that the resources of Europe should be husbanded and used as wisely as ever possible. Yet, it is not clear what policy the British authorities are adopting towards the industries of the Ruhr. Are they to put the coal mines into full working order along with the iron and steel foundries? If they do, they are setting part of Germany industrially on its feet. But if they do not, they are depriving not only Western Germany, but also France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland and even Northern Italy, of their normal coal supply, with a certain result that those countries will be woefully short of fuel in the immediate future, and they will be denying to those countries, as well as to the Germans, many of the barest necessities of re-construction. To the other side of Europe, the Russians have been stripping the countries which they occupy not only of industrial plant but of every kind of tool, implement or instrument, from agricultural tractors to typewriters and sewing machines. We are told that the Russian armies "live on the land" and they appear to be living like a hoard of locusts in the manner of their Asiatic forbears. Such behaviour is unpardonable in the armies of any organized State; instead of bringing relief to people already in distress it is aggravating that distress, and making the lot of these peoples more wretched and more hopeless.

### A New Flight into Egypt

**A** GAIN in the East, the expulsions from the German provinces, taken over by the Warsaw Government, and from the Czech and Slovak countries are breeding a horrible tragedy. It may well be necessary that certain transfers of population should take place in this part of the world: but, if so, the transfer should be delayed till conditions are more normal and be carried through with foresight and humanity. At the present moment, the roads from Silesia and Bohemia are crowded with hundreds of thousands of German refugees who have been driven, helpless and penniless, from their homes, regardless of their political or religious views and with no consideration at all for the simple decencies of human life. In the fields from



which they have been driven, the harvest lies rotting on the ground, and there is no one to gather it ; the former inhabitants are being hounded into a hopeless exile ; as yet, no one has taken their place, to reap their fields and fill their cities. Such shocking and deliberate waste in a Europe which is crying aloud for material relief is a frightful witness to the brutality and callousness which are—alas !—the all too obvious consequence of six years of war. It is not quite as simple as it seems to Lord Quickswood who, in a letter to *The Times* of September 24th referred to the Poles as a “cruel and uncivilized people.” “Uncivilized”—really ? This is surely a curious adjective for the country of Copernicus and Chopin and Mickiewicz. Are we listening to the vapourings of some Left-wing politician ? Or to a scion of the Conservative Cecils ? “Uncivilized”—indeed, when the Polish nation formed, during well nigh a thousand years, part of the Eastern Rampart of Christendom ? “Uncivilized”—but perhaps this is only part of our modern habit of “denigration” of the Polish Government and people, to salve our consciences, that are not a little touchy after our disgraceful abandonment of the Poles ! The Poles to-day are not masters in their own homes. Whatever happens there, is dictated by a Soviet-appointed and Soviet-controlled administration, under a Soviet citizen, M. Bierut. The people of Poland have reason enough for abominating the Germans, and for desiring stern measures against Germany. Some of them doubtless would like to see their Western frontiers extended well into pre-1939 German territory. But they have not been consulted on this point, any more than they were consulted about handing over their own Eastern provinces to Russia. That was done for them, over their heads, and regardless of their wishes, by the “Big Three” at Yalta. The blame for the inhuman policy in Silesia must go to the Bierut puppet Government and to its Moscow masters. The Czechs have probably a greater freedom of action, so that the Czech people must shoulder a greater burden of responsibility for these shockingly inhuman happenings. But, even in Czechoslovakia, it is more and more evident that President Benes is a figure-head, and his Communist associates the real power in the country. A No Man’s Land is being created in this part of Europe. Natural resources are being wasted or destroyed. Hate is the watchword ; and it can breed nothing but a lasting spirit of resentment, and a furious desire for ultimate revenge.

### Obvious Difficulties

**E**VEN with the best of intentions, collaboration between the Western Powers and Soviet Russia would be difficult. Their points of view are so diverse. To one side, the strong tradition of Western democracy ; to the other, an absolute government, in the hands of one party, brooking no opposition. On the one side, a mixture of Christian, Liberal and humanitarian ideas ; and on the other,

a régime which, under the Bolsheviks, broke with the European associations of Russia's past. In spite of the acceptance of an official Marxism (it is questionable whether Marxism itself is properly European), Soviet Russia, by isolating itself from Europe, has rapidly grown more alien to Europe's history and traditions. The Russian people have been educated for twenty years and more in the grossest ignorance of Europe; there has been no free contact between them and European peoples. The Russian authorities are very alarmed by the possibility of such contact and intensely suspicious in all their dealings with the West. Now it is generally admitted that co-operation between the Western Powers and Russia is essential if the World Organization, outlined at San Francisco, is to take effective shape. Yet co-operation is impossible where there is deep-seated mistrust. It may well be that the Russians have genuine grounds for suspicion of British and American policy despite the fact that Britain and America have given immense assistance to Russia during the war and have made large-scale Press propaganda in their own countries on the Russian behalf. Great concessions have been made too in the Russian interest, and some of them at least have been to the detriment of both the interests and prestige of the Western Powers. The atmosphere of the Council of Foreign Ministers in London, was one of hard bargaining with great mutual distrust. The Ministers were not meeting round a table to find the solution to certain common problems, they were facing one another across a table, bargaining and haggling. The result was purely negative and a complete stalemate. One Soviet method is to put forward preposterous claims, e.g., to the Italian colony of Tripolitania or to bases in Eritrea along the Red Sea, and then to display a readiness to waive these claims provided concessions are made elsewhere to Russia which on the face of things ought never to have been made. This is not a method of co-operation between partners but of bargaining between rivals or even enemies. Over the situation in the Balkans the Ministers reached a deadlock. Whether, as they say, from motives of security or to establish a Russian hegemony over half of Europe, the Russian authorities appear desirous of sealing off East-Central Europe from the rest of the world as Russia has been effectively sealed off since 1920. Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Roumania and Hungary have governments which are all controlled by Communist parties enjoying only a minority support. Yugoslavia seems to have gone by default since a weak and misguided foreign policy assisted M. Broz, frequently known in this country as Marshal Tito, to seize power. Fortunately Mr. Bevin who is showing a firmer attitude than his predecessor, refuses to recognize these Balkan governments as "democratic" in the only sense in which Britain and the United States can interpret that much-abused word. At a press conference during the London meeting, M. Molotov tried to persuade London journalists that these governments were "democratic" in the Western sense. Journalists are notoriously

gullible but not to the extent that M. Molotov imagined. Indeed, a welcome feature of the past month has been a franker and more outspoken approach to questions of foreign policy. Some stir was caused by an article of Professor Vincent Harlow, circulated by the British Information Services in Washington. Professor Harlow was only saying what the Catholic press of Britain has been saying for a long time. In fact the secular press is now venturing to write as the Catholic papers have not hesitated to write for the past two years. The sham of so much propaganda has worn very thin in places, and the ugly truth is beginning to appear. Facts cannot be faced until they are known to exist. And most of all in a democracy it is important that ordinary folk who have something to say in political issues should be honestly and adequately informed as to what those issues are.

### Balkan Happenings

**T**HESE "democratic" governments in Yugoslavia, Roumania, and Bulgaria, are trying to consolidate their positions. They have the general approval and, in some cases, the special assistance of Russia. The pretence that the "Tito" government has been broadened has worn very thin. Of the two men from London who joined it, Dr. Subašić is seriously ill and Dr. Milan Grol has resigned because of its arbitrary character. The Yugoslav Government seems to enjoy the strongest Russian support. Hence its confidence that it can make propaganda against Greece and Britain and its exaggerated demands for new territory in Northern Italy and in Austria. But even in Yugoslavia the remainders of the pre-war political parties are asserting themselves and are criticizing and opposing the "Tito" arrangements for the so-called "free" elections due to take place before the end of the year. King Peter has publicly repudiated the three puppet Regents set up in his name on the grounds that they have no authority and do not represent him. Violent propaganda against the monarchy is carried on by the Government, despite the fact that the continuance of the monarchy was to be put as a question before a popular plebiscite. The king himself, members of the Yugoslav Government in London, prominent Yugoslavs like Dr. Maček and Dr. Grol, and generally all leaders of pre-war parties, are lumped together under the convenient title of "reactionaries." The Bulgarian elections were postponed at the demand of the British and American Governments on the grounds that they could not be representative. The Government in power at the moment is an odd combination of members of a military group (the Zveno) and the Communists. In a series of political trials before "People's Courts" they liquidated the three Regents, practically all members of previous governments and a large number of prominent Bulgarian politicians.

Yet, even in Bulgaria the Communists are on the defensive. As long ago as August 29th, their paper, *Rabotnichesko Delo* declared :

All reactionary forces in the country are working out plans to isolate the Communists in the Fatherland Front and to create a Government without Communists or a Government in which the rôle of the Communists will be subsidiary. A Government without Communists means creating a Government against the Communists, involving an estrangement from the Soviet Union and the new Yugoslavia.

The Communist-controlled press stated that the opposition showed great joy when the elections were postponed and gave the impression that the future of Bulgaria would still be in its hands. *Narod*, the official daily paper, commented as follows :

At the moment the elections were postponed, reaction became alive. Their agents, hidden until yesterday, appeared before the nation and expressed their opinions and aspirations ; they thought they might rule the country once again.

Whereupon, the six ministers who had left the Government stated that they did not attack the Fatherland Front and did not repudiate its programme of social reform ; what they objected to was the dictatorship of the Communists. The papers of two other parties in the Fatherland Front, namely the Social Democrats and the Agrarian Union, reveal cracks within that movement's structure ; and various trade unions, at a meeting of August 31st, after declaring their general adhesion to the Government, demanded equal rights for all the parties composing it and the creation of internal security as a necessary condition for the resumption of ordinary social and economic life. In Roumania, the Communists have to move more warily. The present government under M. Groza was installed directly by M. Vyshinsky, the Soviet Vice-Commisar for Foreign affairs, and though M. Groza is not himself a Communist, the key positions are, as usual, in Communist hands. Recently, King Michael demanded the resignation of the Groza government, a request which M. Groza has politely ignored—a commentary on the constitutional position of M. Groza. Late in August, several plots, real or imaginary were discovered, and an attempt was made to connect with them the names of Maniu and Bratianu, the leaders respectively of the Roumanian Peasant Party and the Roumanian Liberals, the two most prominent parties in Roumanian life prior to 1944. Arrests were made, equally of Socialists and Social Democrats. In a denunciation of these supposed plots the Bucharest Radio announced :

Reaction is active which is to disturb the unity of Roumania. It aims at overthrowing all the people's conquest, the land reform, our democratic transformation and our good neighbourly relations with the surrounding states. It wants to eliminate the Groza Government and to drive a wedge between the people and the army, the army and the



Government, and the Government and the King. The Groza Government has proved its strength and unity amid a whirlpool of agitation by the most sinister reactionaries.

It is evident that, politically as well as economically, there is grave discontent in these countries. From many sources one can gather that the really "democratic" parties, the Socialists, Liberals and Peasants, are asserting themselves more strongly against these governments of minority dictatorship which, as a result of the Russian occupation, have been thrust upon them.

### Europe—as a Whole

LATER in this number is an article by Christopher Dawson on Europe as a society of peoples. Re-emphasising the theme of many of his works, he argues that Europe has a strong and definite unity, the result of a common Christian heritage and of much historical experience shared in common, and that, if we fail to consider and legislate for Europe as a whole, we shall be inviting disaster. It is difficult, he declares, to say where Europe ends. What is certain, however, is that some of the countries at present dominated by Russia are entirely European, e.g., Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and that the countries of the Balkans, despite their long existence under Turkish sovereignty, are European too. The policy of Britain and America, with France, is to consider the problems of Europe as a whole. Hence their desire for seriously "democratic" governments in all these countries and their efforts to place the main waterways on the Continent under international control. The Russian point of view which emerged more strikingly than ever during the meeting of Foreign Ministers is that Russia herself should control all the European countries immediately to her West and the whole of the Balkans, with the sole exception of Greece. This is, in fact, the policy of an Eastern bloc in which these European countries would be controlled by Russia, politically and economically. Russia's admirers declare that the purpose of the bloc is to provide security for Russia: those who mistrust Russia consider it an attempt to dominate the entire Continent. Our acceptance of this bloc would mean the handing over to Russia of over a hundred million Europeans, most of them Catholics, and all of them brought up in social and cultural conditions, poles apart from those which obtain in Soviet Russia. Many of these countries have not enjoyed in the past what the Western Powers would call "democracy," and even if left to themselves, might not be model "democracies." But it is nonsense to suppose that they could be happy or free under what is the complete antithesis of Western democracy, namely the Soviet system of the absolute rule of one political party in a rigidly-administered State. At the same time, the Russian press, and the Russian satellite parties in Western Europe, are violently opposed to a Western bloc, in close association with Britain, and also with the



United States, though if the present Russian attitude continues, a great stimulus will be given to its formation, and the Communist parties in Western countries will be severely discredited. Any division of Europe into blocs or spheres of influence will be fatal to the reconstruction of Europe, will render impossible any serious international collaboration and must inevitably lead to conflicts. Consequently, we welcome the evidence of firmness in the attitude of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain and France during the September meeting, an attitude which appears to be decidedly firmer than that adopted by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden during the past eighteen months, e.g., over Poland and Yugoslavia, with results that were no credit to Britain's honour and were positively disastrous for the future of the Continent. It has been frequently said that we cannot be firm with Russia because we cannot afford to quarrel with the Russians. This is a short-sighted policy ; in fact it is just the Munich policy over again, a policy then dictated by our weakness and now universally deplored. It would be far truer to say that if we are not firm with Russia now, we shall certainly find ourselves quarrelling with the Russians later on. Had we made it clear after June, 1941, that co-operation between Russia and ourselves must be based on honest and solid principles such as those contained in the Atlantic Charter and that it was to Russia's self interest to co-operate with us and America on just this basis, the difficulties confronting us to-day might have been far less complicated.

### The Question of Principles

**T**O any Christian reflecting on the world to-day the thought must inevitably occur that what is wrong in the world is, in the first place, moral, and only in a secondary degree political and economic. International co-operation is going to be very difficult not merely because of divergent political outlook or of acute economic situation but also, and far more so, from the absence of a universal recognition of the Natural Law, as regulating the relations between nations and nations as well as between men and men. This law the Russians do not recognize since they deny the existence of its Maker. That is only a logical consequence of their materialistic philosophy. But have the Western Powers shown serious awareness of that law ? Their representatives would, at least, not dare to repudiate its Maker. And, though it is not complete and—on the first point of all—preserves an ominous silence, there is much that is truly ethical in the Charter of the United Nations. Its first chapter deals with "purposes" and "principles."

The purposes are defined as follows : to maintain international peace and security and to that end, to prevent threats to the peace, to suppress acts of aggression, and to settle international disputes "by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice

and international law"; to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determinations of peoples; to work for international co-operation . . . in promoting and encouraging respect for human life and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion; and to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in attaining these common ends.

The second article of this first chapter lays down seven principles, of which the first five are as follows:

1. The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members.

2. All members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter.

3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered.

4. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

5. All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

The preamble to the Charter, largely the work of Field Marshal Smuts, voices the declared intentions of the signatories:

To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and value of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours.

### Principles or Labels

**T**HIS Charter of the United Nations bears the date, June 26th, 1945. Our first sad comment must be that the name of God is entirely omitted, that, in this sincere effort for international peace, the Creator and Judge of all men and all peoples is politely ignored. "Unless the Lord build the house, they that labour thereat, labour in vain." If the Creator be thus ignored, what is the source, and what the sanction, of the moral law of justice and respect for human life to which the Charter preamble so eloquently refers? The results of recent meetings of Big Three and Five, and generally of international gatherings, have been sad and unsatisfactory because, though high and lofty

expressions have been used, they have been subsequently interpreted in an entirely different way. The preamble speaks of "fundamental human rights" and of "the dignity and value of the human person." But what is this dignity in a totalitarian State in which the individual is a mere cog in the State machine? And what are his "fundamental human rights" where the State is all supreme? For the Christian, the dignity of the human person is associated with his position as a creature of Almighty God, with a personal destiny to be realised through a life of service and to culminate in an after-life of close association with God. Genuine democracy—that is political democracy, for there is no other variety—still retains some elements from its Christian sources, when it refuses to subordinate the individual to the State, and recognises that, prior to and above all State-allegiance, the individual has rights, as he has obligations, with which no society has, as such, any title or reason to interfere. These two conceptions of the nature of man are so fundamentally different that it is impossible to apply to them the expression "fundamental human rights" in anything like the same sense. A similar equivocation can be found in the mention of equal rights for nations large and small. How is this possible in a world of power-politics, dominated by a Big Three or Five, unless there be genuine and universal acceptance of an objective system of law? What chance is there, again, for respect for treaty obligations if treaties be interpreted by subjective canons of truth and discarded whenever they are found inconvenient? One of the saddest features of recent years is the manner in which even the noblest words have lost their meaning. The term "democracy," which used to mean that a people was governed by representatives freely elected from parties free to put forward their candidates for election, and where the government was subject to popular criticism and control, is now applied as a complimentary expression, quite regardless of the system of government to which it is applied. Thus Russia is called a "democracy," although it is ruled absolutely by one minority party with neither free elections nor criticism nor control. M. Molotov assures us that Bulgaria, Roumania and Hungary are now "democracies," despite the fact that they are administered by puppet governments, quite unrepresentative of the people. In the columns of the Left-wing Press a "democrat" means simply an "anti-Fascist," ranging from a Liberal professor with Russian sympathies to some desperado who fought in an international brigade. Conversely, if you hesitate to accept their standards, if you venture to suggest that progress is something more serious than a continual side-stepping or shuffling towards the Left, at once you are dubbed "reactionary" or "Fascist," Nobody troubles to define the expression, "Fascist," though, should you examine it and discover that "Fascism" is a system of government in which the affairs of a country are controlled by one political party and where there are neither free elections nor popular control of the

government or party, you will see that this "Fascism" is exactly that form of government on which the Left-wing Press lavishes the complimentary epithet of "democratic." The same confusion is evident in words like "progress" and "reaction." "Progress" used to mean an advance from tyranny to liberty; to-day it may mean the exact opposite. The suggestion that there is something worth preserving in a country—its culture, its religion, the memory of historical achievements in the past—is either derided as idiotic or treated as a dangerous reactionary symptom. Ours is—alas!—an age of labels which are meaningless because they can be given almost any meaning, and are dangerous because they relieve people of the necessity of thought. Ours is—alas!—an age of slogans, bombinating noisily and furiously, full of sound and signifying, if very little in themselves, a great deal in our far too intense political and international atmosphere.

### The Need for Objective Standards

**I**T would be fair to say that, apart from some movements of reaction, the prevailing thought of Europe in the past two centuries has been *subjective*. The individual thinker has fixed and formulated what is to be the truth instead of recognising humbly an objective truth, imposing itself upon his mind. The major "-isms" of to-day, in so far as they can be said to have a philosophy, are essentially *subjective*. For the Nazi truth was whatever fitted into his *Weltanschauung* or general outlook on life just as right and wrong, to him, were terms relative to his national interest. The truth for the Communist is equally *subjective*. In his eyes, that is true which happens to fit in with his general view of life; this means, with the orthodox line of Marx and Lenin. Should you be unfortunate enough to be born a bourgeois or a Catholic, you are precluded from arriving at the truth because you lack the necessary "proletarian" consciousness; you are not in the right subjective disposition to reach the full Communist truth. This is why Communism is a quasi-religion rather than a set of reasoned opinions, a matter of acceptance rather than intelligence. Hence too the fury and fanaticism of Communists in what they imagine to be *subjectively* their holy cause. Fundamentally, there is the reason why all negotiations between the Russian authorities and ourselves run the serious danger of breaking down. As Communists, these authorities have only the one point of view; they cannot compromise, they can merely adapt themselves for tactical purposes, postponing some particular objective till a more favourable time. Yet, on the very face of it, genuine co-operation between nations is possible only when there exist objective principles or, at the minimum, mutually accepted methods of behaviour that will be loyally observed and not misinterpreted for any selfish advantage. In the last resort, these principles can only be those of the Natural Law, clarified and given in greater detail in the Christian teaching. The principles of the Natural Law



are the reflection in human minds and consciences of the mind of God Himself ; they are in conformity with the character of man as a creature of God, endowed with reason and the subject of moral responsibility, so that men behave in fullest harmony with their human nature when they observe this Natural Law. The Christian revelation, safeguarded and perpetuated within the Catholic Church, further illuminates and makes explicit these objective principles. Nor are these principles concerned merely with man's conduct as an individual or as a citizen within one State ; they should control also the behaviour of States to States and peoples to peoples. International law is no arbitrary construction but an attempt to codify the duties of States and their dealings with one another, on the basis of this Natural Law. Any *subjective* approach to truth, as was that of the Nazis and is that of the Communists, is a barrier to genuine international co-operation.

### The Need for Morality

**D**EMORALISATION always marches in the wake of war, and reports from liberated countries in the West bring considerable evidence of such demoralisation. Under the German occupation, life became not only very difficult ; it was made unreal as well. Respect for authority gave way to its disregard, frequently to active opposition ; the secret agent, the saboteur was the good citizen. A black market was, first of all, a necessity and then, in the second place, a patriotic duty, for it confounded the occupier and made it harder for him to govern. But violence and abnormal commercial methods, adopted in however good a cause, are dangerous habits which are not easily unlearned. Add to this a sense of irresponsibility speedily developed when people feel themselves blown here and there in war's vast tempest, the promiscuous conditions of living with cities half laid in ruins, the presence of armies, whether of the occupier or the liberator, and in general the sense of an unstable present and a future quite uncertain—and you have a rich breeding ground for demoralisation of many a kind. The effect of these conditions on the young has been widespread and deplorable : and this, be it noted, not only on the Continent but also in Britain where the number of juvenile delinquents has risen sharply, and part of the former convict establishment at Dartmoor has been taken over as an enlarged Borstal. Years of wise government and high minded civic leadership will be necessary if these disastrous consequences of the war are to be duly remedied. No amount of government and leadership, however wise and high-minded, will remedy them unless they are accompanied by a genuine moral revival and a return to the moral teaching of the Church of Christ. The twentieth century presents the ghastly picture of a world that has made remarkable advances in science and yet bears the marks of a frightening decline in appreciation of morality and the Moral Law. Perhaps nothing has brought this home to thinking minds as



much as the evidence of the destructive power unleashed by the scientists in the atomic bomb. We seem to be moral pygmies staggering about in a fearsome world and armed with the destructive powers of giants. Our lighter-hearted journalists have tried to cheer us up with a vision of a new atomic age in which a thimbleful of atomic power will drive the Queen Elizabeth to Australia and back, and an egg cup of the same mixture will take some of our scientists to the moon. The ordinary citizen may be pardoned if he remains sceptical for he cannot remember that previous destructive agencies were ever put to much constructive use. He does not remember, for example, when he drove his motor car with a cupful of dynamite in place of a tank of petrol or could use gunpowder to fertilize his land. All our experience of discoveries unto destruction is that they destroy and nothing else. Our tragedy to-day is that we enjoy greater power over nature than ever before and are able to harness Nature's forces and resources, yet, outside the Catholic Church, men seem to have less hold than ever on morality and the Moral Law, and less certainty than ever about the true nature and destiny of this creature, Man, who is able to wield these vast powers.

### Slovakia

FROM a correspondent, recently returned from Slovakia, we have received a depressing but all too clear picture of the way in which a small minority, established under Russian influence, is persecuting the Catholics, who form more than 80 per cent. of the population, is driving German and Hungarian peasants into helpless exile, and preparing for a Communist Slovakia. What is happening in Slovakia reproduces in miniature what has been occurring in Hungary and the Balkan States. Theoretically, the Government of Czechoslovakia has full authority over the provinces, quoted in its title. In practice, however, its authority is limited to the Czech provinces of Bohemia and Moravia. Slovakia is controlled by the Slovak National Committee, a Communist organization set up by the Russians. Without the presence of Russian troops, this committee would not last very long; yet everything is now carried out in its name. Slovakia is a fundamentally Catholic country with a Lutheran minority. Last year there were Catholic schools in the following number: 2,200 elementary schools, 20 secondary schools, 11 technical schools and 10 training colleges for teachers. All these schools have been taken away from the Church by the Slovak National Committee; they have been declared State property; no compensation has been paid. All Catholic organizations, even societies of a purely religious character, have been suppressed, and their property too has been confiscated. Prior to the Russian occupation, Slovakia possessed 32 religious papers and magazines. 29 have been compelled to cease publication; only 3—*Katolicke Noviny*, *Nova Praca* and *Putnik Cyrilo-Metodejsky*—may still

appear, but in a severely censored form, and they are forbidden to comment upon present affairs or even to protest against the seizure of the Catholic schools. Many priests have been imprisoned and condemned to forced labour ; others have been deported to Russia, along with a very large number of professional and educated Catholics, of whose subsequent fate nothing is known. Two bishops have been arrested, a third is under police supervision. The Chief of Police is Lietavec, a declared Communist, as are also Husak, the Minister of the Interior, and Novomesky, the so-called Minister of Education. When the Committee began to seize Catholic schools, the bishops arranged for a popular petition to be signed at the doors of the parish churches, asking that the schools might remain in Catholic hands. This campaign was inaugurated on July 8th and it was to continue for three weeks. On July 10th, the Slovak Committee suppressed the petition, for in certain parishes 96 per cent. of the population had signed it ; in Bratislava 8,000 names were added to the petition within two or three hours. The police entered and searched the houses of Archbishop Kmetko of Nitra and of Bishop Jantusch of Trnava and took away with them all evidence of the petition and other ecclesiastical documents. Plenty has been said about the "liberation" of Europe. But this is what "liberation" is meaning at the present time to the small and simple and fundamentally Catholic people of Slovakia. The political situation, like the religious, is disastrous. Only two parties are permitted, the Communists and the "Democrats" ; the latter consists largely of Lutherans, and the Catholic majority of the country is not represented at all. Dr. Micura, the Slovak representative of Mgr. Srámek's party, has been deported by the Russians. There is strong discrimination on political and ideological ground. Professors, teachers, officials have been dismissed wholesale on the plea that they are politically "unreliable" ; their children are not admitted to secondary schools ; they have neither employment nor pension, and many are already destitute.

### **The Egregious Mr. Laski**

**S**OME of us are getting a little weary of Mr. Laski. During his Continental tour he seems to have acted as a Father Confessor to the governments and peoples of Western Europe ; to have warned the French that, should they return a "reactionary" government to power, this would impede the betterment of relations between France and Britain ; to have told the Italian Socialist leader, Signor Nenni, that he must not unite with the Italian Communists ; to have advocated the abolition of the Concordat between Church and State in Italy, and the complete secularisation of Italian education ; and, all the time, to have brandished a cudgel in the face of General Franco. Late in September, he broadcast to the United States what was nothing but an attack on the Spanish Government, with a disguised attack upon the Vatican in his reference to "the Vatican-sponsored King of Spain,

trying hastily to learn the vocabulary of the four freedoms." If Mr. Laski is so anxious to preach the four freedoms, he would be well advised to do so, not in broadcasts to America and not in connection with Spain, but in any of the Slav languages that he may choose, in broadcasts to Russia or to the puppet Governments in East-Central Europe. In his broadcast Mr. Laski had nothing new to say and much that was stale and out of date. The picture of a Franco, only waiting for a nod from Hitler or Mussolini to enter the war on the Axis side, is fatuous. The nod must have been given many a time and General Franco quite as obviously ignored it. Whatever pro-German and pro-Italian sympathies may have existed in Spain during the war (and it was perfectly natural that they should exist, when Russia was fighting among the Allies) Spain preserved, to all intents and purposes, an effective neutrality which Mr. Churchill has publicly recognized as of the greatest advantage to the Allies. It would be unwise to indulge in speculation as to how the war in Europe and Africa might have developed, had General Franco been as ready to act at the Führer's nod as our Left-wing talkers fondly imagine. The flood of propaganda now unleashed against General Franco and Spain derives from Moscow where feelings are still sore at the Communist failure to secure control of the Iberian peninsula in the middle thirties. It is so obviously against British and American interests that there should be domestic trouble in Spain or that Russia should be able to extend her political influence right to the west of the Mediterranean. It is just as unfortunate for the development of more friendly relations between Spain and Britain that this country of ours should lend itself to propaganda which is as ill informed as it is malicious.

### The Newman Centenary

BY the time this number will have appeared, the official celebration of the centenary of Newman's reception into the Church will have taken place. Full details will have been found, of course, in the weekly press. The interest aroused in Catholic circles, not only in Britain but also in the United States and on the Continent, by this important centenary has been indeed striking. Before me I find articles from abroad, for example in the Spanish review *Razón y Fe* for July-August (the title of the article "De Oxford a Roma : En el Centenario de la Conversión de Newman," and its author, A. Alvarez Linera), and in the Portuguese *Brotéria*, for August-September, in which A. Rocha writes "O Centenário de uma Conversão." Among home papers and periodicals, *The Tablet* had a commemorative number on October 6th while *The Westminster Cathedral Chronicle* published a special issue adorned with copious illustrations, and mentioned here in "Our Contemporaries." We are promised three commemorative volumes : the first, from Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne ; the second, from Messrs. Browne and Nolan, in Dublin ; and the third containing the papers read at the Newman Centenary Conference held at

Beaumont College from August 18th to the 25th. This Newman Conference was as genuine a success as it was a brave venture to launch it and organize it so shortly after the end of the Continental war. Great credit is due to the Committee and members of the Newman Association and I am sure that, as a member of that Association, I can re-echo its heartfelt gratitude to the Rector of Beaumont College and to the Superiors at South Ascot and Slough for their indispensable co-operation. The Conference was carried on in an atmosphere of first-class talks that gave rise to discussion and debate, of friendly conversation and a renewal of many contacts with Catholics from abroad, and in the pleasant setting of lawns and trees and a noble river. It was an atmosphere that Newman himself would surely have appreciated. Nor must we forget to mention an admirable Press and Book Exhibition that was tastefully arranged in one of the larger rooms of Beaumont College. Many of the foreign delegates who attended the Newman Conference, and in the following week took part in the Regional Congress of Pax Romana, expressed their delight at the re-establishment of contact with Catholics in Britain and said frankly that they had greatly enjoyed their visit.

#### **Ducketts in the Strand**

ON October 1st there was opened in the Strand, opposite one wing of the Gaiety Theatre, a new and large Catholic bookshop. The premises were blessed by His Grace the Apostolic Delegate on September 27th, when an inauguration ceremony took place with a very representative attendance. The Apostleship of the Press is to-day of the highest importance, for books can be the vehicle of good as, unfortunately, they are all too often the carriers of what is misleading and false, at times even positively evil. Catholics in Britain to-day have had provided for them during the past twenty or thirty years, an admirable treasure of Catholic literature. Names need not be mentioned but the Church has been well and faithfully served by a sequence of writers, many of them laymen and women, whose names are well known and whose books are widely read, outside the Catholic fold. They have presented the Catholic philosophy of life, the Catholic interpretation of history, and an application of Catholic principles to the various problems of the day, with qualities of mind and gifts of style that command attention and appreciation. And there is the widespread need for prayer books, books of devotion and works of a more theological kind. It was a happy choice to name the new bookshop after the martyr, Blessed James Duckett, who himself printed and peddled Catholic literature in the very heart of London. Readers who would like to know a little more about the martyr, will find it in a booklet published by Mr. Douglas Organ of Chancery Lane. The booklet is entitled "Hanged for a Tale" and its author is Mr. W. R. Titterton. All success to the new venture in the Strand! May it help to spread the light of Catholic Truth!



## ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA<sup>1</sup>

"The fire never saith, It is enough" (*Prov.* xxx, 16)

IT is no common tribute to the greatness of a great man, when his genius can extort unwilling admiration from another unquestionably great man, born in another century, bred in another country, aflame with the inspiration of a different creed. May I detain you then, for a moment, with one of the most interesting comments, I think, ever made on the life of your holy patron? "I read over that surprising book, the *Life of Ignatius Loyola*; surely one of the greatest men that ever was engaged in the support of so bad a cause! I wonder any man should judge him an enthusiast. No, but he knew the people with whom he had to do; and setting out with a full persuasion that he might use guile to promote the glory of God, or (which he thought the same thing) the interest of his Church, he acted in all things consistent with his principles." That was how St. Ignatius looked to John Wesley. I suppose a book might be written, certainly an article, discussing the extent to which the early organization of Methodism was based on the model of the Society of Jesus. Let me only record one curious detail to illustrate what I mean. When Wesley sent out Dr. Coke to organize the Methodist movement on the American continent, after conferring upon him episcopal powers which he himself did not possess, Dr. Coke whiled away the tedium of the journey by reading one biography; the biography of St. Francis Xavier.

When that has been said, something else deserves to be said; that although Wesley, as an observer of facts, was sometimes well ahead of his age, his criticisms of men and of literature are uniformly valueless. He has all the *naïveté* and the cocksureness of a schoolboy. Most profoundly, and quite obviously, he had got St. Ignatius wrong. He thought of him as a cool, long-headed business man, sitting down to weave a spider's web across the face of the world, to the supposedly greater glory of God. And he was precisely wrong. There was nothing Wesley himself hated so much as being called an enthusiast, and in asserting that St. Ignatius was not an enthusiast, he felt he was defending him from a calumny. But an enthusiast was just what St. Ignatius was. He was full of that fire which never says "It is enough."

I shouldn't wonder if Wesley was thinking of an obscure pamphlet, written by some early enemy of the Society, which drew out an elaborate parallel between St. Ignatius and Don Quixote. Surely

<sup>1</sup> A panegyric preached on the feast of St. Ignatius of Loyola, July 31st, in the Church of the Immaculate Conception, Farm Street, London.



the author of that sorry performance was in truth nearer the mark? After all, when he lay a wounded man in the castle of Loyola, the bed-reading which the young Ignatius demanded was exactly what Don Quixote would have demanded—some stories of knight-errantry. If the library at the Castle had been more extensive, it would have been quite possible—humanly speaking—for the young Ignatius to become crazed with his reading exactly as Don Quixote was, and go about the world making a fool of himself exactly as Don Quixote did. As we know, the library failed him, and he had to be content with the next best thing, the *Lives of the Fathers of the Desert*. And it was perfectly open to the unsympathetic critic to say that this change of programme only produced the same symptoms, with a difference, as the stories of knight-errantry would have produced. Perfectly open to him to say that the young Ignatius became crazed with reading the lives of these long-dead hermits, and went about the world making a fool of himself in imitation, not of Amadis de Gaul, but of St. Paul and St. Anthony. He became our Lady's knight-errant, with very little of the practical man about him; at any time during the next few years of his life you would have set him down as a dreamer, and prophesied, quite rightly, that his dreams would not come true.

It would be a fascinating speculation, which some theologian of proved orthodoxy would do well to discuss, how it is that the Saints have so frequently misread the nature of the vocation to which God's grace was calling them. St. Francis thought he was being called to convert the Mohammedans when he was really being called to convert the Christians. St. Philip Neri thought he was meant to evangelize the Indies when he was really meant to evangelize Rome. And St. Ignatius, with the whole world waiting for him to evangelize it, thought he was meant to go and settle down in the Holy Land, like St. Jerome. But already he had become known as an enthusiast, and the Holy Land, it was felt, was no place just then for enthusiasts. His arrival at Jaffa was no more welcome than that of a flying bomb, and seraphic wings gently shepherd him back to his starting-place. There was trouble enough without letting loose fire-brands like this.

It is true, not long afterwards the Saint seems to have had the idea of gathering a band of companions round him, and the man who does that may be credited with the ambition of starting an organization, a movement; he has got beyond the introspective stage at which he thinks only about his own sins and his own soul. But even then, how misplaced his first efforts were! He went to the University of Alcalá, and formed, as he had hoped, a little clique of followers, but they all left him. Then he went to Paris and tried again; once more his magnetism drew souls to him, but once more they played him false just when he thought the movement was ready to start. All the first Jesuits except St. Ignatius himself were spoilt

Jesuits. It looked as if his epitaph was to be the line Cardinal Newman was so fond of quoting, "Thou couldst a people raise, but couldst not rule." At last the real companions came forward, Peter Fabre, and Laynez, and the rest. And what did the Saint propose to do? To go out and convert the Holy Land. You see, he is a dreamer, living in the past; he still thinks in terms of the Middle Ages. Here are vast new continents discovered, full of idolatrous savages to whom the name of Christ is unknown; here is Europe itself, Christendom itself, rent in two by the disintegrating effects of the new learning; and all St. Ignatius can think about is going out to convert the Soldan, like St. Francis.

In a sense, I think you can say that, under Divine Providence, it was this enormous vagueness about the Saint's plans which made it possible for the Society of Jesus to develop as it did. It is the common experience of everyone who wants to do great things for God's Church, that you go to the authorities with your scheme all beautifully mapped out, and the authorities are delighted and ask you to do something else. Just because St. Ignatius had no blue-print ready-formed in his mind of what he wanted the Company of Jesus to be like, the Company of Jesus proved to be exactly what was wanted; it was prepared to take on the things that needed to be done. Here is the king of Portugal demanding missionaries for the Indies; well, of course we have no idea where the Indies are or how to get there, but let's go. Here is the Pope wanting people to refute the Lutheran heretics in Germany; so far, the love of God has been more in our line than formal theology, but of course, the Holy Father must have what he wants. A college is to be started for boys, and there is nobody to conduct it; it is true the Founder himself only started learning Latin at the age of thirty-three, but still, a college—that will be the very thing. The insatiable fire which burned in St. Ignatius seemed to keep his new experiment liquid, ready to be poured into any mould which the needs of his time demanded.

If St. Ignatius, during the last years of his life, became the ruler of a world-wide Society, and hammered out, in the solitude of his Roman cell, the framework of an institution which has miraculously defied the centuries, that was not because his nature, or his tastes, qualified him to be a great organizer; his biography shows him the same Ignatius still. But he was a good enough Jesuit to accept the uncongenial task, and to execute it more perfectly than another man would have, prompted by the love of ruling to rule. But is it the *framework* that has enabled his Society to defy the centuries? Believe me, the spirit of man does not live on such barren diet. If the Society has lived, and not only lived but maintained its genius unaltered, and not only that but adapted itself, beyond belief, to the conditions which new times imposed upon it, the secret lies not in the Constitution that was drawn up by the patient methodist of the

Gesù, but in the Exercises that sprang, ready-made, from the eccentric visionary of Manresa. Other founders have been concerned to perpetuate this or that doctrine, this or that rule of life, this or that devotion, this or that liturgical exercise. For him, one thing was all-important—that the members of his Society should be taught to recognize the love of God as a fire which never says “It is enough.” Every issue of human destiny should be faced, every chord of the human heart touched, every generous instinct in human nature appealed to, in the hope of securing *that* object. And the Society has thriven, and will thrive, not by the dead weight of organization, but by the living fire which still communicates itself to its members. When, once in its history, the Society was disbanded, that sacred fire was rediscovered, as the fire hidden by Jeremias was rediscovered by the returned exiles at Jerusalem. That flame, above all, is the link which binds it to its past; that flame, above all, makes us look forward, undaunted, to its future.

Meanwhile, for us others, what is the message of the feast we are celebrating? Ignatius, laboriously perfecting, at Rome, the scheme of his institute, or Ignatius, pouring out his heart at Manresa—which is to be our model? We live in times when great importance is attached to *planning*; when all the numerous disabilities from which the human race suffers are put down, perhaps too readily, to the careless, free-and-easy, way in which we and our fathers have lived. Christian people, at such times, are liable to catch the infection from their surroundings; we are tempted, not a few of us, to go round criticizing the Church for its want of organization, its want of central discipline; “We must have a *plan*,” we tell ourselves, “or we are lost.” Well, the Church is an old institution, and she has her anomalies, her dusty corners; it is easy to be impressed by later models. But I think that St. Ignatius, as he looks down at our modern world, disturbed by world-conflicts, and by possibilities of world-apostasy, not less than his own, is content to forgive us our want of planning. What he finds ominous, I think, are those lives, so many of them, even among us Catholics, which still consent to limit their love of God by saying, “It is enough.” It is enough that I should go to church so many times, practise such and such devotions, take such and such precautions to discipline my mind and my senses, give up so much of my time to my neighbour’s needs, so much of my income. . . . If it were possible for a shadow of melancholy to fall across those blessed lives in heaven, I think that great heart of his would heave a sigh of melancholy that there should be so few great hearts among us; so few conflagrations among us of the fire which never says, “It is enough.”

R. A. KNOX.

## EUROPE—A SOCIETY OF PEOPLES

**T**HE question of the nature of Europe—of the relations of the European states to one another and of the parts to the whole—has always been the great problem in all attempts to establish an international order. For the concept of Europe has usually been taken for granted in international discussion. It is seldom defined, and when defined, it has usually been only in a superficial way.

In the past this did not matter, because the international community was regarded as practically identical with the European community, and the law of nations was in practice simply the body of rules which were commonly accepted by the states of Europe in their dealings with one another.

The situation changed gradually and almost imperceptibly during the 19th century—first by the rise of the United States and the independence of the states of Latin America, and secondly by the development of the international status of the independent powers of Asia and their conformity to European diplomatic usages. But Europe remained the centre and pattern for the international system, and when the League of Nations was founded in 1919 as a world organization, it was really not so much the creation of a new system as the completion of the process of European expansion and the application of the European international system to the rest of the world. But the Treaty of Versailles which inaugurated the League of Nations failed to establish European order. The old system of the balance of power and the concert of Europe was abandoned but there was no place in the new system for Europe as a society of peoples. Europe was no longer sufficiently united to lead the world, and the world was not sufficiently organized to impose order on Europe. And consequently instead of being the organizing centre of world order, Europe became the focus of international disorder.

No wonder that under the circumstances many people feel that not only has Europe forfeited her position of world leadership but that she no longer exists as a society of states or as a unity of any kind whatever. They feel that the leadership of the world has passed to the great world states, the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A. and the British Empire, and they look on Europe rather as Europe looked on the Balkans in the 19th century—a region of quarrelsome and disorderly small states that have to be pacified and policed by the great powers.

And false though this view may be, there is no doubt that the events of the last ten years have brought Europe lower than at any time in her history and that, the war now ended, her fate will be decided not



by the great Continental powers as in the past, but by the new world powers which are mainly extra European.

This is probably inevitable, but it makes it all the more necessary that the public opinion of the allied countries should be wide awake to the issues that are involved—that they should realize the necessity for a genuine European settlement and not merely a world settlement in the interests of non-European powers, in which the problems of Europe are viewed from a non-European angle. There is a real danger of this, for Russia is divided from Europe by profound ideological differences; America is still deeply influenced by the traditions of isolationism and non-intervention in old world politics; and Britain retains much of her traditional insularity; while all three were united only in their determination to stop once and for all the threat to their security which came from the strength and aggressiveness of the central European powers.

Of course they all recognized the responsibility of Germany for this, but so many other European states had become involved by alliance, by collaboration, by capitulation and by neutrality that there is a certain danger of the anti-German or anti-Axis or anti-Fascist feelings of the allies leading to an alienation of sympathy and understanding from Europe as a whole, and to a corresponding resentment on the part of European peoples for our indifference and lack of understanding towards their problems and ideals.

Consequently I would put the understanding of Europe in the very first place among the tasks that lie before us since it is an essential precondition of the attainment of international order and security. A disintegrated Europe means a disintegrated world and a breeding place for the very evils which were responsible for the present war. For even to-day after the immense material expansion and political advance of the non-European world which have so vastly increased the scale of our thinking and have developed the standards by which the statesmen and historians of the past reckoned, Europe still remains the greatest centre of world population and the richest, and the most highly cultured area in the world. It is also, in spite of its feuds and dissensions, the most interdependent and inter-related group of states that exists. Every European state depends on its neighbours to a degree that is unknown in Asia and Africa and which is only very partially attained in America.

It is not possible in the space at my disposal for me to discuss the historical causes of this inter-relation, it is only possible to look at the picture as a whole and to consider the results of this process and the present *constitution* of European society—if we can use the expression. Now the most striking characteristic of Europe is its diversity and variety. It is a continent of peninsulas and narrow seas, where the land runs out into the Atlantic, and the Mediterranean and the Baltic penetrate into the very heart of the land. Geographically speaking,



it is not a continent at all, but merely a peninsular extension of the great Eurasian land-mass. In fact it is a man-made continent, an historical creation, an invention of the Greeks, who adapted a myth in order to express their sense of independence towards the civilization of Asia and their struggle for freedom against Persian imperialism.

And the same diversity which characterises Europe as a whole is also characteristic of its parts. Europe is an extremely regionalist society, and almost every European country has only been unified with the greatest difficulty and usually in quite recent times. Take Yugo-Slavia—you have Croatia, Slovenia, Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, old Serbia, Macedonia, Montenegro—all with their separate characteristics and their strongly marked social personalities and historical traditions.

Take Spain—in the north alone you have Galicia, Leon, Old Castille, the Basque Provinces, Navarre, Aragon, Catalonia—half a dozen peoples speaking different languages, with their own traditions of culture and even of separate political institutions.

Take Italy, which in its great days was a sort of miniature Europe—a society of states of the most diverse type divided by fierce political rivalries but united by a strong sense of common culture, a kind of miniature league of nations.

Take Switzerland—the oldest and perhaps the most successful federal state in the world, which grew out of the most diverse and apparently anarchic system of leagues and alliances, and in which the cantons still retain their ancient tradition of autonomous life.

So it is throughout Europe—everywhere the tradition of independence and diversity and an intense development of regional life. It is not till we come to the sandy featureless plain of North East Germany that we find a different type of landscape and a different pattern of society and thenceforth Eastwards diversity yields to uniformity and the influence of the great central land mass becomes more pronounced.

For Europe has never had an Eastern frontier. Like the Hellenic world, it is a marginal development which has never thriven far from the sea. The nominal geographical frontier of Europe has never been either a political or a cultural one. The South Russian steppe was colonized at about the same time as Ohio, and Odessa is the contemporary of Cincinnati or Cleveland. A hundred years ago, the two greatest states of Eastern Europe extended, one from the Danube to the Persian Gulf, the other from the Baltic to the Behring Sea. At that time and throughout the period which preceded the crisis of the present century there was a very sharp contrast and division between Eastern and Western Europe. The former was dominated by four military empires, superimposed on a mass of subject peoples and provinces, while the latter consisted of a large number of independent states which were for the most part constitutional monarchies and which were or aspired to be independent national states.

All this is a matter of common knowledge. But I do not think it has ever been sufficiently recognized how many of our present problems arise directly from this situation. I do not think that we can insist too often that the two world wars, the failure of the League of Nations and the general collapse of European order are due, not as the Marxians say, to the inevitable consequences of the capitalist system, but quite simply and directly to this European dualism—to the breakdown of the four military empires in Eastern Europe and to the far reaching changes involved in the construction of a new state system to take their place. This process of change reaches back to the Turkish Revolution of 1908 and the abortive Russian revolution of 1905, and ever since then—that is to say for forty years or so—Eastern Europe has been in a state of effervescence and change, with new states rising and falling and a continual change of frontiers until finally Western Europe and ultimately the whole world were drawn into the orbit of disturbance. I do not mean to say that capitalism (or better the financial-industrial development of Western society) has no share in the catastrophe of our civilisation, but its responsibilities have been in the sphere of culture. Left to itself capitalism does not breed world war—indeed where it has been most highly developed in the U.S.A. and the British Empire, the economic rivalry it produces has been reconcilable with peaceful relations and even a considerable measure of mutual disarmament. The real source of world war has been the disintegration of the military empires—a disintegration which made them prefer the risks of war to which they were accustomed rather than the risks of political changes which threatened the basis of their power and ultimately their very existence.

The fall of the empires produced two great changes. The first was the resurrection of the submerged nationalities of Eastern Europe, some of which like Poland and Bohemia had had a great history in the past, while others like the Finns, the Estonians, and the Slovaks were virgin peoples who had never before taken part as political entities in the society of European nations.

The second was the rise of the new type of mass state which we call totalitarian. This was due in part to the difficulty of adapting the forms of parliamentary democracy to the very different conditions of Eastern Europe and in part to the survival of the traditions of the old military empires in Eastern Europe and their readaptation to the circumstances of the new age.

For though these empires were from one point of view old fashioned, cumbrous, out of date political organisms; they were, from another point of view, more adaptable to the requirements of state socialism and mass organization than the liberal democracy of Western Europe, created to meet the needs of a prosperous middle class society which valued personal liberty, and private property and individual initiative above all else.

Thus the political evolution of Eastern Europe in the 20th century proceeded apparently in two opposite directions. On the one hand, the old Ottoman and Austrian empires disappeared and their place was taken by small states, based on the principle of nationality, while on the other hand, the Russian and Prussian monarchies were transformed into great mass states which were stronger both internally and externally than the military empires that they replaced.

How is it possible to reconcile these two apparently contradictory lines of development with one another and with the conception of a European society of nations? After the last war the twelve or fourteen lesser states of Eastern Europe, however sharply divided by national rivalries, were as a rule sympathetic to the ideals of the League of Nations and were anxious to share in the general movement of European culture and to strengthen their political and cultural links with the peoples of Western Europe. But the rise of the totalitarian super-states destroyed the prospects of such a development before it could mature. The ideology of the new Nazi Germany demanded a new aggressive policy of racial expansion at the expense of the smaller peoples. According to the original Hitlerite gospel, Europe was not a society of peoples, but the homeland and the colonial territory of a single master race. And though the threat was primarily directed at the smaller states of Eastern Europe, it obviously threatened the Western states also, while its ultimate objective was Russia.

Russia meanwhile had developed her new totalitarian polity and economy on a far wider basis than any other state possessed. But Russia, unlike Germany, did not require colonial territory in Europe. She had her own vast Eurasian territories to develop and exploit. Nor was Russia precisely a member of the European society of nations; the U.S.S.R. was a society of nations in itself. And the return from the Petersburg of the Czars to the Moscow of the Soviets to some extent indicated a growing consciousness of Russia's Eastern mission and the share of the Asiatic peoples in the new political order. Consequently there was no inherent and ineluctable necessity for a collision between the U.S.S.R. and the smaller peoples of Eastern Europe, as there was in the case of Germany. Nevertheless once the catastrophe had taken place, it was inevitable that Russia should seek to strengthen her Western flank against the coming German attack at the expense of her smaller neighbours. And thus the smaller peoples have been ground between the upper and the nether millstones and the whole international structure of Eastern Europe has been destroyed.

It is important for us to realize that this structure will not be restored automatically by the defeat of Germany, however total and final it may prove to have been. It demands farsighted and enlightened statesmanship, both on the part of the Western allies and of the U.S.S.R. It also requires wise leadership and a spirit of co-operation among the European peoples themselves. And all these conditions are hard to

realize in a Europe which has been subjected for twelve years to the pressure of totalitarian propaganda and for nearly six years to the material and moral evils of total war. Yet if the cause of the smaller nations is abandoned and they are left to become client states of the remaining world powers, it is no use thinking that the consequences of this decision (or rather indecision) will be limited to Eastern Europe. It means that the cause of Europe as a whole is abandoned and with it the cause of international order and international peace.

Moreover, although the system of client states or spheres of influence may appear to be in the interests of the great powers, this is counter-balanced by the fact that it naturally tends to stimulate the fear and greed of the other world powers and thus to increase the dangers that it is intended to ward off. And consequently the freedom of the small nations and the reconstruction of the international system of Eastern Europe on the basis of national independence is not only a desirable ideal; it is also sound policy. It is, in fact, the only policy which could conceivably unite all the great powers. Russia has no need for territorial expansion in the west, while she does need an Eastern European system in which the smaller states should be sufficiently independent and prosperous not to be used as the instruments of hostile power politics. Moreover, it has been her traditional policy, at least in the Balkans, to encourage the development of the Eastern European national states.

The Western peoples, on their side, need a free and prosperous Eastern Europe; and they are morally and ideologically committed to the defence of the rights of small nations and the principle of national self determination. And the experience of the present war and the years that preceded it has shown that it is impossible to preserve these rights and principles in Western Europe if they are lost in Eastern Europe. The world has become too small for it to be possible to localize war, and neutral status is no protection against totalitarian power politics.

But the small states play just as important a rôle in the international structure of Western Europe as they do in the East. In pre-war Europe there were fourteen independent states in the East exclusive of the U.S.S.R., and fourteen in the West exclusive of Germany. It is true that the Western states included three great powers with a population of over forty million apiece, whereas all the fourteen states of Eastern Europe except Poland were under the twenty million mark. But if the small states of Western Europe are not quite so numerous as those of the East, they make up for this by the strength of their national consciousness and the importance of their contribution to European culture. It was in Western Europe that the smaller states first obtained a clear constitutional recognition of their rights in the society of nations, and the existence through so many centuries of states like the Swiss Confederation and the Kingdoms of Denmark and



the Netherlands, side by side with the great powers, is one of the most striking features of European culture.

At the present time it is often said that the day of the small state is over, and that total war and totalitarian economic planning make their survival an anomaly. But are the great powers themselves in a much stronger position? I mean the old Western European powers—as against the totalitarian world states? England is to some extent untypical owing to the strength of her links with the non-European world. But France, the classical example of the old type of Continental great power, shared the fate of Belgium and Holland and Denmark. And Italy, the equivalent power on the side of the Axis, proved to be equally insecure. It is only as part of a larger whole that the states of Western Europe can survive, whether they are great or small.

And so we come back to the starting point that Europe is a society of peoples, and can only survive as such. If only this idea was firmly implanted in the minds of statesmen and educated men and the men in the street, there would be more chance of its being realized. Unfortunately the whole weight of government propaganda and official history and politics has always been so concentrated on the ideology of the state and the nation, that the larger unit has been left to take care of itself. Long before the Germans had invented their totalitarian conception of autarky, European nationalism had an autarkic bias which made men neglect and undervalue the international aspects of European society except in so far as these could be viewed in an abstract and universal form.

Thus we see, on the one hand, an intense but narrow national state patriotism; on the other, a broad, but rather abstract, internationalism—both alike characteristic products of European culture. In the past both these tendencies could co-exist with one another in the same country and even in the same individual, so that a somewhat unstable equilibrium was established. But in times of revolution and war this balance is destroyed and the abstract ideals of humanity and civilisation are sacrificed to the interests of the sovereign state which is a law to itself. And consequently after every great war we find efforts being made to establish some kind of supernational order which will replace abstract ideals by a legal or institutional system of relations. Thus after the Napoleonic wars we had the Holy Alliance with its strong insistence on European unity and solidarity and its neglect of the principle of nationality, while after the last war we had the League of Nations which recognised the existence of a world wide society of states, but did not find any place in its organization for that historic society of peoples which we call Europe.

Is it possible that the war that has just ended will have achieved some definite advance towards the organization of Europe as an organic unity? Hitherto there has not been much sign of positive constructive purpose on the part of the allies. But on the other hand, the logic of

events is pointing increasingly in that direction. There are, it seems to me, two obvious conclusions to be drawn from the history of the last few years. One is that the position of the smaller states in Europe has become impossible from a military point of view and from the standpoint of power-politics, for no small state can stand against total war and the associated methods of economic and psychological pressure. The second is that from the moral and cultural point of view the position of the small state is as strong as ever, so that even a successful total war cannot overcome the national will of even the smallest and weakest of European states.

Therefore it seems clear that Europe will have to find some form of organization which safeguards the national being and social freedom of the smaller states by some kind of federation or some system of permanent alliances for mutual security.

The small nations cannot resign themselves to be the protectorates or client states of the adjacent Great Power, especially if that great Power is a totalitarian one. Their rights must be statutory ones guaranteed by international law, and providing a stable basis for the ultimate construction of a European commonwealth. I know that this is not practical politics. But we have got to make up our minds. Either our conception of practical politics must be enlarged to deal with these issues, or we must resign ourselves to the partitioning of Europe and the working out of the process of total war to its ultimate consequence of total destruction.

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON.

---

---

## **"THE MONTH" FORWARDING SCHEME**

### **IMPORTANT NOTICE**

Will readers and missionaries who are members of the Forwarding Scheme, please note that during a 1945 air attack on London all the reference books and the card index relating to the Scheme were destroyed when the private house where the work has been done since the war, was severely damaged. All names and addresses were lost and the Hon. Secretary is therefore unable to write to those who have written but failed to enclose their full address. It is also not possible to look up information which some missionaries and readers have asked for. There was a waiting list of Missionaries who had asked for **THE MONTH**; this too was lost. Will those who would like **THE MONTH** please send their names and addresses, in **BLOCK** letters, to the secretary?

## THE LAST SUPPER AND ITS LITURGICAL SHAPE IN HISTORY

IT is not very often that a fertile mind, patiently and diligently cultivated by years of careful Patristic reading, watered by prayer and sensitive to the relevance of every movement of the day, has both the courage and the ability to gather into one all-embracing synthesis the sum of its findings and judgments on the theme which has engaged it all these years. Such a rare achievement might be the proud boast of Dom Gregory Dix of the Anglican Abbey of Nashdom—if he were given to boasting: his monumental work on the Mass<sup>1</sup> is so many-sided, so rich in information, so suggestive in historical intuition, that ordinary mortals like ourselves are left gasping at the amount of personal work that has gone to the making of it.

Dom Gregory works on an enormous canvas—one so vast indeed that it raises the question whether it will not defeat its own purpose. This is, as he says himself, to produce a work of the sort “which can be covered by the useful French term *haute vulgarisation*” (p. xvi); but unfortunately for this purpose, he has a great deal to say (and to demonstrate in some detail) which goes counter to the most approved views of his *devanciers*, however frankly he admits his debt to them. Even “*haute vulgarisation*” supposes that the main lines of the presentation of a subject have already been discussed among the experts; sheerly new ideas, if important, should first be tested in the crucible of the technical reviews before being generally dispensed in this way. One cannot help feeling that in spite of the life and the close touch with realities which characterize the “untechnical way” in which the matter is presented, in spite of the fact that it is mostly easy and often very entertaining reading, there are large sections which even “the thoughtful and educated Christian” will find too much for him in a work of this length and girth. On the other hand, to our way of thinking, the new ideas, penetrating, suggestive and uplifting as they often are, still need to be weighed and judged by the technical experts in liturgical history, and it is only fair to put the question: Will any of these experts wade through the 750 closely-printed pages of this work,—so much devoted to more or less ephemeral inter-Anglican polemics,—in order to pick out those passages which give (or perhaps only suggest) the evidence on which the new structure is based? And if *they* do not, how can the ordinary lay or even ecclesiastical Tom, Dick and Harry tell

<sup>1</sup> *The Shape of the Liturgy*. Westminster: Dacre Press. Pp. xx + 764. Price: 45/- net.

whether he can rely on the final synthesis, however persuasive its presentation, however attractive its shape? Will not the cautious be inclined perhaps to echo what was unkindly said in a letter to the *Church Times* that "much of it may just prove to be *Ipse Dixit*"?

Perhaps this is carping criticism which will be disproved by the event. It arose out of the hugeness of the canvas on which the author works. He is clearly most at home in the pre-Nicene and the Cranmerian periods and dwells most on these, but no century is neglected, and especially in the early period no scrap of evidence from whatever country, "rite," or church it may come, has been consciously overlooked. From the Last Supper and the other New Testament evidence, through all the tantalizing allusions of the Apostolic Fathers, through Justin, Irenaeus, and the author's own Hippolytus to Cyril of Jerusalem, the Apostolic Constitutions, *Marius and Addi* and the rest, we are taken backwards and forwards and back again, not just comparing this document with that to prove a dependence which may not matter at all, but trying to enter into the lives of those early Christians, so as to share their feelings about the Eucharist, to realize how they looked on it, what it meant to them in persecution times, and in what way and why it developed, when peace (more or less) came to the Church with Constantine. It is on this line of approach that the thorny problem is tackled of the great diversity of ways in which Mass was said in different parts of the Christian world when that peace came.

Thus more than half the book is devoted to the first four centuries, and by that time we have the impact on the liturgy of two very different things (whose influence we might so easily overlook): the Monastic Movement with its Divine Office, and the Development of the Christian Calendar.

Thereafter, where one senses a lesser familiarity with the historical atmosphere, the introduction of various adjuncts to the Mass in the nature of vestments, incense and the rest, and the ceaseless borrowings, additions, re-arrangements that went on in East and West alike, are described and explained, until the East had completed the "Shape" of its liturgy, while the West went on in much the same way (and of its nature still goes on), adding new Masses for new feasts and enjoying many local variations such as the generality of Easterns do not possess. Here a long chapter, of some 120 pages, "places" the work of the Reformers in general and of Cranmer in particular, and the book ends with the author's tentative suggestions how the Church of England might set about remedying the present chaos in her own liturgy.

Some such outline, however inadequate, had to be given here in order to suggest the breadth of vision which characterizes the work, and to give a background to the reflections which follow. And the first thing that must be said—it is a delight to do so—is



that, especially for the earliest period, Dom Gregory shows a feeling for living tradition which is only too often absent in works on the early Church. Linguistic and literary tradition have been overworked at the expense not merely of *oral* tradition, but of the tradition of things *done*. Attention has been concentrated on *literary* dependence to the practical exclusion of all else; too often the first recorded statement of a fact or of a belief was regarded as the writer's own invention, or, if this was called in question, *documents* were presupposed as the necessary alternative "sources" from which he took his statement. A little reflection is all that is required to see that there are other possibilities in all such cases, and where there is question not of things merely said or thought, but of things done, of customary actions, the most obvious antecedent to the first record of them is no literary source at all, but the sheer actuality of the custom. That is why we so heartily welcome Dom Gregory's treatment of the origins of the Eucharist in the early Church; one may differ from him in this or that detail, but the method is the right one.

From the first, as he rightly insists, the Eucharist was an *action* which the Christians performed in common because of Christ's command; it was something obviously traditional (if not yet determined in detail) when St. Paul wrote about it to the Corinthians; it is therefore the meaning of that customary action which is most important and to which he devotes his chief attention. It involves not only a careful study of the directly pertinent Scripture texts, and of the setting of a Jewish religious meal, but also a re-living of those first years of Christian life and an estimate of the progressive interaction between their faith and the practical fulfilment of Christ's wishes. This calls into play a good deal of practical imagination, and details have to be filled in to make it all real; but if the details might well have been filled in otherwise (as the author himself recognizes), we have at least a possible reconstruction which is in touch with the realities of human life. It is a reconstruction which, in so far as its main framework is concerned, is solidly built, and not a mere piece of abstract speculation whose possibility depends on its being kept carefully away from all conditions of time and place and of ordinary human nature.

This kind of real thinking and imagination has, of course, its dangers and its pitfalls; it is safer, no doubt, to leave it all undetermined, and to take refuge, as *we* are ordinarily justified in doing, in the fact that such tradition is guaranteed by God and that, whatever the process, the Mass to-day is the proper form for us of what the Last Supper was to the Apostles; but for those who are unsure of any such guarantee (and even for ourselves, when Higher Critics of whatever kind dogmatically assert that Paul or the early communities borrowed from mystery religions or the like), such work of the imagination, under the control of the historical data at our

disposal, is invaluable, and indeed to be expected from the scholar who deserves his name for more than *kal*-counting. It fosters faith and devotion (witness St. Ignatius's contemplations on the life of Our Lord in the Spiritual Exercises) even when it is wide of the mark in the rigorous historical sense, and the best Scripture scholars of the day make use of it freely, while calling attention, more than their predecessors always did, to the uncertainty of the details, which may well have been different without affecting the main conclusions.

\* \* \*

It is with regret that for lack of space one cannot pause to discuss many interesting and at times alarming suggestions which Dom Gregory makes about the early history of the Mass. One cannot however pass over in silence his treatment of the pre-Reformation Church, though even here only general reflections are possible. His treatment calls for criticism, and yet it is difficult to formulate it.

The fact is that he disarms criticism in a very literal way. Were it not for his patent sincerity, one might put it down to a conscious ideological technique, but such a suggestion would no doubt surprise him and he would be pained that anyone should think that his presentation of the facts was any other than objective. For all that, one or two illustrations of his method, conscious or unconscious, will show why he makes it difficult for a critic to come to grips with him.

Dealing with the advent of Protestantism, alongside the intellectual and theoretical causes of the breach, he naturally places the "real superstitions" and "the great practical abuses in the government and machinery of the church" (pp. 627, 628). But he knows that the old Protestant attack was overdone; he only mentions, "widespread corruption" in order to put it aside in favour of "a general torpor and an utter lack of spontaneity"—"at all events so far as England is concerned" (leaving standing the suggestion, which he more than hints at: "Probably conditions in England were better—perhaps much better—than in many regions abroad"). Yet even this mitigation in favour of England is felt to be not quite enough: ". . . all was by no means corrupt in the old religion . . . Cardinals Fisher and Pole offer examples of sanctity and beauty of character . . . Thomas More was as holy a layman. . . . There were zealous parish priests. . . . John Hales and John Larke. The martyred Carthusians . . . strength to endure sweetly and patiently and with striking courage. . . ." In other words, all that might be brought up to counter the original assertion or suggestion is frankly admitted; a sense of impartiality of judgment is created, and the result is that his return to the charge is all the more forceful:—"Yet when all has been said of this kind that can be said, the fact remains. . . ."

The critic feels that the ground has been cut from under his feet. Yet the process might have been inverted without any difference

in the facts appealed to. It is the line of argument which we, as Catholics, instinctively take: first to display the greatness of the saints and martyrs of the period, then to admit that, for various reasons, wealth and maladministration had weakened the spiritual life of the Church as a whole, and that there *were* abuses in some monastic establishments and elsewhere, concluding however with Dom Gregory (but in the opposite sense): "Yet when all has been said of this kind that can be said, the fact remains. . . ." And our adversaries are as exasperated with us, as we are with him. Ultimately the difference between us lies in this, that whereas he is anxious to find, if not a justification, at least an excuse for the Reformers, we know, as the Church has always known, that men will always be able to make out any number of pleas for rebelling against the authority of the Church, but that, ultimately, in spite of the failings of even her prelates in the highest places, men have no valid excuse for thinking that they can "reform" the Christian religion in independence from her. However evident it may become that she is not impeccable, one has not yet begun to have an excuse for saying that she is not infallible or indefectible.

Another illustration of his technique can be found in his treatment of the distinction, which he never tires of emphasizing, between the corporate and the individual conception of the liturgy. The distinction has, of course, its validity; whether it should be as radical as Dom Gregory makes it out to be, is not our question here. What we are concerned with is his line of presentation. Put extremely baldly it is this: the Church from the beginning used the liturgy as being essentially a *corporate* action, so that a Eucharist in which bishop, presbyters, deacons and laity did not *each* take an active share, did not enter their minds even as a possibility. The Catholic Church has always retained the memory of this, at least enshrined (if often overlooked) in many of the formulæ or prayers of the Mass. But, in practice, she has allowed the active part to be confined to the officiating "presbyter," the lay folk merely being present and looking on, or—worse still—being only formally represented by the server at a private low Mass. The result of such a passive (if not torpid) rôle in the liturgy has been that the laity have been led, and indeed encouraged, to "fill in the time" with private meditations or prayers, the individual concentrating on his personal thoughts and emotions, and on his own "edification", instead of fulfilling his proper function of co-operating *actor* in the corporate action performed by all the "orders" of the Church, each according to its degree. Finally, the personal, in place of the corporate, significance of the liturgy was all that was retained—in various ways—by the Protestant reformers; and thus, so far from returning to primitive Christianity, these were only, in fact, adopting and canonizing a medieval impoverishment of the Church's genuine act of worship.

After such a presentation of the facts, the author can gild his pill for everybody. His main contention (which however, he does not obtrude too much) that the Roman Church has at least substantially if not, in practice, sufficiently retained the true meaning of the liturgy, will tend to please ourselves, and to turn the eyes of his co-religionists and of Free Churchmen more favourably towards the Mass as such; on the other hand, the latter will be more easily reconciled to the idea that the Reformers went astray, for they can still put the blame on the Church of Rome. But for Rome's practical encouragement of individualism, *their* Eucharist would not have degenerated into a kind of optional devotion instead of being the great corporate act of worship it was meant to be. On the one hand, *we* cannot complain when the ideas of the sacrifice, of the physically real Presence, of the action as distinct from mere prayers and feelings, are brought to the front as being an inheritance going back to the early Church and even to the Last Supper itself; *we* cannot object to his severe repudiation of the all too ignorant mutilations perpetrated on the Eucharistic service by the Reformers; on the other hand, *they* are reassured that this is not merely a piece of Anglo-Papist propaganda, because the root of all the sixteenth century aberrations is firmly planted at the door of the Roman Church itself.<sup>1</sup>

How is one to appraise such a carefully balanced apportionment of praise and blame? Is one to welcome, with relief, so much understanding of the Mass and of the Christian dispensation as a whole? There is no doubt that nothing yet has been written which contains so much promise of convincing the Protestant world of a Christian inheritance, the very existence of which they deny, and whose nature they have even forgotten since the days when the Reformers first distorted the Shape of the Liturgy. If this is so, any radical criticism will seem not only ungraceful, but positively obstructive to the greater good of religion in this country. For the book corrects so much that has been taken for granted since the Reformation; it even makes many truths acceptable to those for whom any other sort of presentation of them would be wholly unpalatable. It is a step forward. Shall we leave it at that, and merely record our misgivings? For after all, it naturally assumes that whatever mistakes attended the 16th century changes in England, they only affected the *bene esse* and not the *esse* of the old *Ecclesia Anglicana*. And one may be allowed to wonder whether it is not likely to be more successful in confirming the native suspicion and dislike of Rome, than in encouraging the adoption of a true and more Catholic faith in the Eucharist. But ought this to prevent us as Catholics from giving the book our blessing, our very unofficial *Imprimatur*, seeing that, after all, it does contain the seed of so much good?

<sup>1</sup> "I believe that the history of Protestantism itself indicates that they [the Reformers and their followers] were the chief and most permanent sufferers by the accumulated mistakes of the mediæval Latin church" (p. 639).



There would seem to be a parallel between this problem and that created by De Lisle's pamphlet on Reunion (1857) *On the Future Unity of Christendom*. The differences are too obvious to need pointing out, but one of Newman's letters to De Lisle, explaining why he could not wholeheartedly agree with him in his reunion work can serve, *mutatis mutandis*, to throw light in the present issue :

The tendency of a portion of your pamphlet is, far indeed from your intention, to persuade individual Anglicans to wait out of communion with the Catholic Church, till they can come over with others in a body. There is such an extreme difficulty in rousing the mind to the real *necessity* of leaving the position into which men have grown up, that they will easily avail themselves of any the slightest excuse—and even a hint from a person so deeply respected as yourself, so beloved, yourself too a convert, is more than sufficient to turn the scale. And then suppose, if these very dear and precious souls, say Dr. Pusey, are taken away in this state, when grace has been offered them, and they have not followed it up.

I think it is for the *interest* of Catholicism that individuals should not join us, but should remain to leaven the mass—I mean that they will do more for us by remaining where they are than by coming over ; but then they have individual souls, and with what heart can I do anything to induce them to preach to others, if they themselves thereby become castaways ? (*italics Newman's*).

The labyrinth of the human conscience, the subtleties by which we persuade ourselves that what we sense to be our duty is only a bogey of our imagination, the rationalization by which we justify to ourselves the avoidance of painful change—we all know these tricks of conscience even when the effort, which duty calls for, is of the slightest. And we can be blandly self-complacent withal. At least is there little self complacency in this book, and we can thank God for it. But in spite of this, and in spite of its many undoubted merits, an unqualified commendation must be withheld. There are many who, no matter what we say or do, will go on "evolving" on the lines they have become accustomed to ; our commendation or condemnation will make no difference to them. But there are some, perhaps as many, who reading this book will suddenly realize that the "glorious Reformation" was not so glorious as they had imagined, and who for a moment will hesitate to accept the complicated interpretation by which Dom Gregory justifies the Church of England in spite of all. For such as these, a commendation of the book's general outlook coming from a Catholic pen, might well "turn the scale." Our responsibility, our genuine love for them all restrains, us. The delicacy of their situation, the tremendous pull which all their associations—family, social and, not least, religious—exert on them already, forbid us uttering a word that might obscure the light which they have glimpsed. It is not callousness ; it is the truest sympathy, which realizes that those who are faced with some hard choice "will easily avail themselves of any the slightest excuse."

MAURICE BÉVENOT.

## THE ELECTION VICTORY OF THE LABOUR PARTY AND LATIN AMERICA

TO the British reader it may be a source of some astonishment that the recent elections in Britain, with the subsequent victory of the Labour Party, should have produced an instantaneous and profound reaction in such parts of the world as Honduras, Cuba or Paraguay. It is true, nevertheless, that nothing short of the cessation of hostilities in Europe or the collapse of the Japanese Empire, precipitated as sensational an outburst of public sentiment as the British elections. The press all over the Spanish-speaking world was devoted to detailed analyses, long-range judgments, predictions and forecasts, usually with a minimum of factual knowledge as to the working of British politics. On the day that the results were announced, the Cuban Communist daily, *Hoy*, struck the jubilant note with the entire first page given over to demonstrating that the swing to the Left in England was the commencement of the world-wide trend towards Communism. The conservative paper, *Diario de la Marina*, upon whose head is heaped with salutary regularity the condemnation of Nazifascist and Falangist, published a table showing the actual Parliamentary strength of each of the parties that had participated in the polling. The Communist Party quite evidently had not come out at all well. It sought to prove that Labour in England was really not at all radical and might more properly be compared with such institutions as the American Federation of Labour in the United States which is notoriously to the right of centre. This paper did find it somewhat difficult to explain Mr. Laski away. It did so by referring to the former Labour Government and to the fact that the outstanding members of the new Government had all served in the coalition Cabinet and in all probability would carry out a policy that would not deviate too pronouncedly from that of the Churchill Government.

The interest in the British elections naturally involved speculation on various aspects of international affairs and the probable repercussions. In Mexico, the press was particularly concerned with the attitude of the new Government towards the Franco régime in Spain. The Spanish question is not an academic one in any part of Latin America and it is a very real one in Mexico, where the Giral Republican "Government" has been set up and where it has been recognised as the official and legitimate Spanish government by Mexico. Mexico has long been a sort of prolongation of the Spanish political scene in the sense that the number of Spanish exiles is extraordinarily large, their activities extremely visible, and the atmosphere receptive to

their propaganda against Franco, since the Leftish inclinations of the Mexican Government made impossible any recognition of the Franco administration as a *de facto* régime. Events in Spain produce an immediate reaction in Mexico and so it was that much joy was manifested that "appeasement" was now over and that the new Labour Government would unquestionably toss Franco out through the use of pressure without loss of time.

In Argentina and other parts of South America, the British elections were watched with equal eagerness because relations with Great Britain are particularly important in terms of commerce and trade after the war. In Argentina especially, there was concern with the possibility of a change in policy towards that country. It is well known that during the period when the U.S. Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, was denouncing Argentina as the nest and refuge of Fascism and the last of the totalitarians to "buckle under," there was noticeable reluctance on the part of the British Government to go in for sanctions or even the threat of sanctions against the Argentine Government, presided over by General Edelmiro Farrell. Would the advent of the Labour Government mean that the heat would be put on to oust the present régime in the name of democracy? This was another of the many imponderables that the new state of affairs in England produced in the Western Hemisphere. Catholic public opinion in Latin America, in so far as there can be said to exist a Catholic opinion, was beset by the fear that the victory of Labour was the entrance of the wedge of Communism. To the British reader this may appear singularly puerile. But for the Latin American, watching something that he understood only in part, from a considerable distance, the defeat of Churchill meant simply that a Government more akin to that of the Soviet Union had assumed power and that with the chicanery distinguishing the Communists once they get a hold, the trend toward the Left would soon set in. This same opinion seized eagerly upon the first bits of information that came in that a large portion of the Catholic population of England had voted for the Labour Party and that some of the new Catholic members of Parliament belonged to the now majority party. This was a solace to many who momentarily anticipated that the hammer and sickle would be raised over the Houses of Parliament and that the traditional speaker's post in the House of Commons would give way to a Soviet praesidium.

The fact that the British elections could thus electrify the entire Latin American world and plunge it into endless speculation, is demonstrative of the degree to which this area of the world is dependent even for its political influences and ideas on Europe and the United States. While the twenty republics of Latin America are independent in the political sense, elect their presidents and congresses, and carry on at least under the fiction of sovereignty, the plain truth is that in all, with the exception possibly of Argentina, the economic and social

structure is still colonial and has all of the features and characteristics of a colonial régime. The majority of the Latin American countries are dependent economically on one or at the best two or three products. Chile functions on the basis of nitrates ; Colombia on coffee ; Cuba on sugar ; Venezuela on petroleum. Even gigantic Brazil, larger in area than the United States, is hard put to it in maintaining internal stability when the coffee and rubber market fluctuates too violently. Thus we have a bloc of countries under republican institutions, proud of their independence and national sovereignty, whose life blood must be pumped in from outside and whose literal subsistence depends on what transpires in markets far beyond their control. Technical sovereignty has been attained and defended with a fervour and zeal that would do credit to the most intensely nationalistic countries of Europe. But in spite of that, there has not developed in Latin America an indigenous political system or even a set of ideas that have sprung out of the soil of this hemisphere.

The history of political ideas in Latin America is the almost slavish imitation of institutions elsewhere. From the time of independence at the beginning of the last century, the constitution of the United States, the Declaration of the Rights of Man in France, and British Parliamentaryism were the strongest influences in Latin America. Simón Bolívar, the great Liberator, was in politics very much the disciple of Jeremy Bentham and was obsessed with the determination to implant in Latin America, practices that flourished elsewhere and which seemed to him to be the answer to the difficulties that beset the incipient Latin American republics. The tragedy of the State in these countries has been that it has always been something of a fiction. The State did not evolve ; it was merely imposed. It was created out of nothing, by a sort of constitutional prestidigitation. All of a sudden there it was, complete and absolute. Neither the constitutions themselves nor the governments that grew up with them had any particular relation to the social and political reality of the people. Hence the idea that has long been held in the English speaking world, that the Hispanic peoples, and especially those of Latin America, are peculiarly addicted to revolution, turmoil and disorder. The popularization of this fiction reached such colossal proportions as to be practically the common place interpretation. Turbulence and disorder have distinguished the life of independent Hispanic America for these many decades. But certainly it is not to be attributed to the character of the people, to the blood that courses through their veins or the language that they speak. The reason is not an anthropological one ; a moderate Parliamentary procedure is not a matter of race, blood or pigmentation. The reason lies in the fact that after three centuries of one type of political experience, the Spanish Americans were suddenly plunged into a totally different one. It is as though the Greek city states had been called on to function as a rigidly unified organism such



as the Third Reich of Adolf Hitler. It was the evil effect of the transplantation of ideas which did not convey anything in terms of practice. It was futile to suppose that the Spanish Americans could take over the political practices and habits of the United States and make them work. This was no more possible for them than it would have been for the people of Belgium to adopt, out of a clear sky and with no transition at all, the whole body of institutions developed in the kingdom of Dahomey. The consequence is that there exists a long and deep-rooted tradition of influence from abroad that permeates the political thinking of Hispanic America and makes so infinitely difficult its real and effective independence.

The Latin American political parties rarely reflect anything substantial in terms of the social realities in which they work. I would suggest this as another source of real tragedy all over the Hispanic American world. The social problem as such, the social question as we know it in other parts of the world, is terribly acute everywhere from Mexico to Chile. The abyss between classes, the utter misery and poverty of the peasant masses, are facts that no amount of glossing over will eradicate. The great, overwhelming mass of the people in almost every Latin American country live at a level that is shocking according to any standard. The Indian farmers of Mexico and Central America, the Negro in the West Indies and Brazil, the Quechua and Aymara-speaking aborigines of the highlands of Peru and Bolivia are unbelievably abandoned. Only in certain of the republics such as Argentina and Uruguay do we find a standard that meets the needs of an advanced people. Here class lines are less marked and the social order more balanced. Even Chile with its social legislation that makes it one of the most outstanding countries in the world is the victim of an outrageous land system that maintains thousands upon thousands of its people in a state little short of serfdom.

The worst part of the whole thing is that the overwhelmingly vital importance of the social question as such has not even become apparent to many of the responsible leaders of Latin America. Unhappily the refusal to come to grips with the question and meet it realistically has led to the development of violent and radical movements whose purpose is to meet the question straight on, in view of the reluctance to meet it by slower and more evolutionary means. Hence the importance to-day in Latin America of shifts toward the Left elsewhere in the world.

All over Latin America are evidences of an upsurge of Left political movements. Mexico went "Left" long ago and is still wallowing about in the confusion of dialectics and Marxist materialism. In Guatemala last year, after the overthrow of the unspeakable dictator, Jorge Ubico, a new and revolutionary Government came into power, of young idealists, who prepared, in starry-eyed idealism, to transform their fellow countrymen into something quite different from what they

have been heretofore. In Costa Rica, a model little republic of less than a million people, Communism reared its head a couple of years ago and was scotched by the extraordinarily adroit action of the Archbishop of San José who knocked the props out from under the Marxist programme with the development of a strong and well organized Catholic social movement, under the name of *Centro Rerum Novarum*. Colombia, one of the republics with the longest tradition of peace and internal tranquillity, is in the throes of a severe social crisis. It is not by accident that the Colombian city of Cali was chosen for the meeting a year ago of the Latin American Confederation of Workers, under the guidance of the renegade professor of philosophy and arch-demagogue, Vicente Lombardo Toledano. In Ecuador, a little Indian republic on the slopes of the Andes, the Left wing is in power under the guidance of President Velasco Ibarra. In Peru where dictatorship was absolute for many years, the "Leftist" movement functions under the name of the APRA, that is to say, *Acción Popular Revolucionaria Americana*. After years of persecution and subterranean activity, this party has come forth into the light of day and now forms one of the members of the coalition that placed the new President in power. Its programme is a strange and uncanny mixture of orthodox Marxism, intense nationalism and, prior to the war, anti-Americanism.

Chile went through the experience of a Popular Front, along lines that remind one of the France of the days before invasion. The reaction set in and the experience was salutary in that it brought with it a return to more normal thinking. To-day Chilean politics are divided between Conservatives and Communists, the only two political forces of any consequence in the country. In mountainous Bolivia a Nationalist and Socialist movement terminated in the accession to power of a band of young men who saw the salvation of their country in an extreme nationalism which took the form of the ousting of foreign economic interests and an advanced social programme destined to rescue the Indian from his misery.

In Brazil, in spite of the dictatorship of these many years, relaxation has brought back into activity many of the "Leftist" influences held in check for a long time. President Getulio Vargas recently released the Communist leader, Carlos Prestes, from prison and he now figures in the present election campaign for the new president. In Uruguay and Argentina the situation is fundamentally different. These are nations with a European background. Their people think more as do those of Europe than any others in Latin America. Uruguay is astonishingly sane and balanced. Its homogeneity and acute political acumen make it to-day one of the sanest republics in this hemisphere. The Argentine situation is too complex to be discussed in a few pages. Nevertheless, it may be said along the line of these general thoughts that the military régime now in power has curtailed the influence of the Left and has forced them back into the rôle of conspirators.

What about Communism as such in Latin America? It is not strong from the point of view of numbers or influence although potentially it represents a very considerable force. In underdeveloped countries, most of which have proportionately small populations and the great mass of the people are agrarian, Communism finds the way exceedingly difficult. But the semi-colonial status of Latin America, plus the severe economic shock to which it is exposed as the result of an unbalanced economy, are positive forces that pave the way for movements of social change and radical transformation. Perhaps the two American republics, in which the Communist parties have made the most headway, are Chile and Cuba. In the latter, circumstances have conspired to favour it. Since 1933, with the collapse of the dictatorial régime of Gerardo Machado, Cuba has known the greatest freedom of expression both from the public platform and in the press. In spite of the social programme of the governments of Fulgencio Batista and Ramón Grau San Martín, Cuba has still the "one crop economy" that has characterised it ever since independence from Spain in 1902. Sugar represents everything for Cuba. The lot of the sugar workers depends entirely on the price as fixed abroad. In general the rural worker in Cuba is far from enjoying a privileged situation as to income or the conveniences of life. Communism has made progress because it has been organized. It has worked diligently under intelligent direction. In spite of the superiority of the technique of the Communists for winning converts, the real explanation of their success rests on two points: the fact that there is a real social problem to be solved and the continuation of which unsolved is quite intolerable, and the fact that the class now occupying the more privileged position from the economic point of view is utterly unwilling to recognize that the times no longer permit of a sort of barony-serf arrangement which has prevailed these many years. The refusal of the economically privileged to see the very plain mote in their own eye is the greatest cause of uncertainty. And almost nowhere in Latin America is there more than the most meagre indication that the governing classes have any consciousness whatever of the meaning of the times in which we live and the necessity of contributing at once to necessary social reform or allow its advocacy to fall into the hands of the Marxists.

In the political thinking of Latin America as a whole, three international forces or issues play a major part, hence the importance that the British elections played in pointing up comment and speculation. The first of these issues is the United States.

Latin America is a vast appendage of the United States. Its economy flows from the north in large measure. Its monetary system is pegged to that of the United States. Its trade, especially import, is almost exclusively American. The United States is, in a word, the overshadowing influence in Latin America. In spite of the fact that the former policy of intervention and direct control have ceased, non-

recognition by the United States is a curse which few Latin American governments can successfully resist. Hence the fortunes of politics and social change in the United States play an all-important part in what Latin America thinks and does. All of this is coupled with the mixed feelings of Latin Americans toward the United States—feelings of distrust and suspicion and resentment mixed with a recognition that American influence is, in numerous ways, much better than that of other Powers and perhaps in the world of realism, more defensible.

A second influence is that of the Soviet Union. This is a new force that is just beginning to make itself felt. All over Latin America there is evidence of the impact of Sovietism on the thinking of people. Elaborate embassies, artificially fomented cultural institutes, libraries, journals and reviews, concerts and art exhibits and a generous sprinkling of demonstrations of the prowess of the Red army and the juvenile force of the Soviet people. The theme which underlies all this is that the U.S.S.R. is remote geographically but is the rising star to-day. It is youthful, strong, self-created and audacious. Latin America is new and open to advancement. Perhaps the time has come for these republics, weak at present but in search of a greater future, to look toward the daring innovations of the Soviet Union rather than the humdrum routine of British or American capitalism, the influence of which they have known for well over a hundred years. The prestige of the Soviet Union in Latin America is very high. It has the virtue of novelty and is surrounded by the halo of heroism. It appeals to the rank and file of Latin Americans.

But it comes into conflict however with the profoundly Christian spirit of the 130,000,000 Latin Americans, who in spite of the storminess of their religious life are deeply rooted in the Christian tradition of the West. Here is a third great factor—that of the Catholic Church and faith. And so Latin America is torn between different tendencies. It is a vast continent of restless, eager people, who have not directly experienced the effects of war, but have felt them in the form of economic uncertainty and the threat of instability. This great mass of people, not as yet fully mature politically and lacking clear and strong guidance, are the victim of impulses that pull them in contradictory directions. Left-wing influence is on the rise, beyond a doubt. Their reaction to the British elections shows how anxious many Latin Americans are to find an "example" abroad, to discover further encouragement to justify this move. Space does not permit the discussion of how those of Catholic thought and ideas are meeting this challenge. The salient fact is that what occurs in Europe and particularly in Western Europe will determine the course of events in Bolivia and Salvador. Paradoxical as it may seem, Latin America, much more than the United States, is still a prolongation of Europe.

*Humacao,*

RICHARD PATTEE.

*Puerto Rico, West Indies.*



## THE LOVE OF GOD

“**I**F I speak,” says St. Paul, “with the tongues of men and of angels and have not charity, I am become as a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And if I should have prophecy and should know all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I should have faith so that I could move mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.” (I Cor. xiii, 1.)

The “charity” of which St. Paul is here speaking is the love of God : and what he says of it is that without this love all human acts, be they never so excellent intellectually, ethically, socially, or on any other grounds, are devoid of value before God and of no good to ourselves. For our only good, rightly understood, is our supernatural good : all else that we call good, in whatever category, deserves that denomination only in so far as it ministers to, or at least does not impede, this. Our Lord Himself sets this standard of measurement when He says, “If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out . . .”, or “What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul . . .”. Our supernatural good is that which is proper to our nature as it was in the beginning raised (and is now once more raised through Christ) above its purely human condition to a share in the very life of God, by that Adoption of Sons which invests us with all the rights and privileges, as well as the obligations, of true children. In the full and final sense that “good” is what we call our Salvation, including during this life all that conduces to that end.

St. Paul says, then, that salvation is unattainable without the love of God, in whose eyes the lack of this renders all natural good entirely profitless. In this he goes no further than did Our Lord Himself when, revalidating the words of the Law revealed to Moses, He laid down that the Great Commandment, in which he summed up the whole of God’s demands upon us, is that we should love Him with all our mind and heart and soul and strength, i.e., with all that we have of intellect and of will, and with every spiritual and natural faculty that is in us. That the love of God both defines, therefore, and exhausts the entire field of our duty to God, is an inference from which we plainly cannot escape ; yet to many it must seem a hard saying ! We can understand and accept our duty to worship Him and to render Him reverence, obedience, praise and service : we know too that it is within our power to do all these things. But if by the word “love,” as it is used in such a connection, is meant what we mean when we use it of our relations with one another, what in practice are we to make of it ? For it seems that

as a necessary foundation for real love between two persons there must be community of nature, personal knowledge and contact, a sharing of experiences and a mutual dependence in one way or another, and none of these requirements are or can be met as between God and ourselves. Yet on the other hand, Our Lord's use without qualification of the one word "love," both when He spoke of our obligation towards God and when He extended it to our neighbour, leaves us in no doubt that it has indeed the same meaning in each case. The problem remains, then, and there is no way either out of it or round it : we have to love God with real love, and nothing of ours is pleasing to Him unless we do.

But if we endeavour to fulfil our obligation by such means as meditation upon what He is to us and what our Faith teaches us that He is in Himself, we shall be disappointed, for in the end all that we shall get from either source will be our own *thoughts* of Him and those of others like ourselves ; and love by reasoning or report is a contradiction in terms.<sup>1</sup> Also, we are to love Him above all things, and the moment that we begin (we cannot help it) to balance His claims against those of the other objects that compete for our affection, we lose sight of Him altogether, because inescapably we thus range Him alongside these as if He were a creature Himself like they. And in addition, and as a consequence of this, we are led to interpret the command to love Him above all things as implying that if we love God we may love nothing else, being unable when we approach the matter thus to perceive that in fact the better we love God, the worthier object, the better we shall love all lesser things, and conversely.<sup>2</sup> Besides, the love that we are to have for God is to be a real love indeed, but a *supernatural* one ; and this cannot be the outcome of any purely natural argument or operation.

It comes to this then, that we are no more able by the use of natural means alone to arouse in our hearts the supernatural love of God to which we are bound, than we are able to set a fire burning in a grate simply by laying the materials for it. For that, something is needed that is not yet there, something altogether different from anything that *is* there, and the paper, the wood and the coal must be set in action by a flame from outside : and the question is, what is this flame and how are we to apply it ?

It is the teaching of the Church that by the Sacrament of Baptism, the one Sacrament which is absolutely necessary for salvation, there are infused into our souls (that is, directly communicated to them) habits of the three virtues of Faith, Hope and Charity, called "theological" because they relate immediately to God. This is to say that our souls acquire a permanent quality which enables them to exercise these

<sup>1</sup> As a poet has said, "I will not have any thoughts of thee instead of thee."

<sup>2</sup> As Lovelace makes the warrior knight reply to the complaint of his lady that he cannot really love her if he can leave her so easily to go to the war—"I could not love thee dear so much, loved I not honour more."

virtues as supernatural acts (such, namely, as are impossible except by the gift of God), whereby we believe and hope in God not because reason inclines us to do so, but just because He is God; and we love Him, again, not on account of anything that our minds tell us about Him, but for Himself alone. The acts of faith, hope, and charity which an unbaptised person might exercise towards God compare with those elicited through the infused habits somewhat as the utterance by one man of words in a language of which he is ignorant would compare with their use by another who understands what they mean: a difference, therefore, not of degree but of kind. Much as any citizen of this country, for instance, is capable of filling up a voting-paper correctly, but in the absence of some special and improbable legal exception his vote does not count before the Law unless he be of age: so any person is capable of making a formally correct act of love of God, but in the absence of some exceptional and uncovenanted grace his act of love does not count as such before God unless he be baptised.

It will be seen, then, that not all our learning nor our good intentions will by themselves enable us to give to God love such as is none the less demanded of us. That to which these natural means may lead us "profiteth nothing" as St. Paul says, because there is lacking to it that supernatural character which is essential to our 'good' in the only true sense. But the whole point is precisely that *because* of the infused habit of Charity which is ours as baptised Christians, we *are* in fact able to elicit at will acts possessing that character: we are equipped not only for laying but for lighting the fire. Without entering into the question of the impulse and support of grace which are needed for the performance of this as of all supernatural acts, we may say that whenever, being free from mortal sin, we deliberately formulate an expression of the love of God, no matter how dry and detached it may sound or feel to ourselves, we are actually giving Him the love which the Great Commandment requires of us. We are bringing into play the permanent habit with which we are endowed: we are liberating our supernatural faculty from the inhibitions with which our ignorance or incredulity have encumbered it in our minds. *Amicus Dei esse si voluero*, says St. Augustine, *ecce nunc fio*; which may be paraphrased, "If I *want* to love God, I *do* love God"—it is as easy as that!

One realises, of course, that a difficulty of a practical nature still remains. To be assured of the reality of our love of God we wish to *feel* it, to be as emotionally conscious of it as we are of our love for our fellow creatures; and this is just what seems to be wanting and indeed to be beyond our reach. There are in the lives of the saints many striking examples of this felt and intensely affective love, as we know. But however much these may stir our admiration and edify us, their ultimate effect is too often to depress rather than to encourage us, so little, so rarely, so uncertainly are we aware within ourselves of any-

thing resembling what we so much envy in them ! It may perhaps help us to overcome the worst of this 'defeatism' if we consider two points which seem to be relevant to the matter.

First, that one is already halfway to doing anything that appears difficult when one has persuaded oneself that one *can* do it : and that perhaps in this particular we are somewhat like persons who *can* see because they have eyes, but do *not* see because they keep them closed : for our Faith tells us that we really can love God in the fullest sense of the word, and expressly insists that this love is not a mere philosophical abstraction.

Again, it is a matter of universal experience that by the constant repetition of any act which is not purely mechanical, we not only acquire greater facility in its performance but also, as it were, both conform ourselves to it and assimilate it to ourselves : and it is to be remembered that here we have to take into reckoning not the ordinary course of natural law alone but the transcendent power of grace too, subduing us to itself. It is indeed unquestionable that the frequent elicitation of acts of love of God does in fact lead inevitably to the dawn of a genuine feeling, in quite the ordinary sense, of love for Him : and those who have attained to the possession of this tell us that, looking back, they wonder how anything in the world can ever have had any meaning at all for them without it.

But in spite of the evidence to the contrary that seems to accumulate against us as we look into our consciences, the fact is that we do love God much more and much more truly than probably we are ready to believe. Or are we going to affirm that the labour that we give ourselves to do His will and the uneasiness that we suffer when we think ourselves separated from Him, our obedience to His authority manifested in the laws and teaching of the Church, and our submission to the restraints and obligations that the Christian profession involves, all proceed from no other motive than the self-regarding ones of meriting reward and escaping punishment ? We are entitled to think better of ourselves than that : and for all our well-grounded consciousness of inferiority and insufficiency we may venture to make our own the words of the Prince of the Apostles, who also did not know how to answer the question "Lovest thou Me?"—"Lord, thou knowest all things, thou *knowest* that we love thee !"

R. H. J. STEUART.

---

#### EDITORIAL NOTE

All contributions submitted to the Editor must be typed and be accompanied by a sufficiently large stamped addressed envelope—stamps (or Post Office coupons from abroad) alone will not suffice. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research. They should not ordinarily exceed 3,000 words, and must be intended for exclusive publication in the "Month," if accepted.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to The Editor of "The Month," 114 Mount Street, London, W.1, and not to the Publishers : Business Communications to The Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15.



## AN ARCHBISHOP LOOKS AT INDIA

**T**HE meeting with members of the Newman Association at their Centenary Conference and the Conference of Pax Romana which followed immediately gave me a welcome opportunity to communicate to University students some experience gained during eight years in Bombay. Everybody knows what St. Francis Xavier owed to his own university training, and what the career might have been which he abandoned to spread the kingdom of Christ. Those were truly in his tradition who like Father Ricci and his companions in China saw the vital necessity of using the best elements in European culture as the vehicle of Christian truth in Asia ; the same holds good of Father de Nobili who to facilitate access to the Indian Brahmin made himself Brahmin in food, clothing and customs, cutting himself off in great part from the solace of contact with his own brethren. The problem of adaptation of the Christian message is far more than the creation of a native clergy and a native hierarchy. Obviously, that is essential ; but it is not enough. We have to provide for the reasonable demands of the Hindu, Moslem or Parsee who seeks to find in the Indian priest not only a man of his own colour born in his country but one who in receiving the Christian message, has lost nothing of what is good and desirable in the culture of his own country.

Reference has been made in the MONTH about a year ago to a missionary problem which arose in an acute form last year. It is strange and significant that it had not occurred long before, for the University College of St. Xavier's in Bombay has flourished for some sixty years ; numbers have risen at times as high as 2,200 men and women, the great majority Hindus, Moslems, Parsees. Among all those thousands, many of whom have become close and intimate friends of the Fathers, there have been hardly any conversions at all. As far as the women are concerned, this may have been due in part to the extreme reserve associated with the land of purdah. The Holy See had long desired that a University College for women should be entrusted to nuns, and my predecessor, Archbishop Goodier, had taken initial steps in this direction soon after the last war. The policy has been fully justified even in the short time during which the Religious of the Sacred Heart have had their University College affiliated to the University of Bombay. Their influence has been profound and far reaching. Though they have as yet no Indian subjects, even the most perfervid of Indian Nationalists among the students, Christian and non-Christian, have testified to the respect for Indian culture shown by their European and

American teachers. It was inevitable that this should create a problem for earnest enquirers who simply could not but ask themselves searching questions as to the source whence the devotion and culture of the nuns proceeded. Then again, there is a challenge to a woman's nature in the ideal of sacrifice, and no one can help knowing that the Catholic Church is missionary in her very essence; that these women would gladly share the secret of Christ with others.

So it came about that one of the young Parsee students who had already been contemplating the step of conversion for some years at a convent of the nuns of Jesus and Mary, sought and received Baptism at my hands. It is very difficult for us in England, brought up in respect for freedom of conscience, to understand the explosion that followed; it is perhaps best to explain it by a recent proposal for the codification of Hindu law. Among the grounds proposed for divorce were: (1) lunacy in one of the parties; (2) leprosy or some such disease; (3) conversion. That background may show how the University of Bombay came to adopt by a majority vote its "fundamental policy" of not allowing in any affiliated college any activity tending to conversion.

The second Parsee student who became a Christian was not even a member of the College at the time; she had been kept virtually a prisoner in her own house for about a year, under the closest supervision extending to all her movements and to her correspondence. She had a perfect right, being of age according to the law of the land, to follow her conscience; after a year of almost intolerable strain, her friends with my consent removed her from her home under police authority; she was baptized in Bombay and found refuge with the Jesus and Mary nuns at Simla, over a thousand miles away.

The "fundamental policy" was at once invoked. It was, according to all but universal belief, by a travesty of justice that the University, after a discussion of four or five hours in the senate, decided to disaffiliate the College. The measure was never carried out, but only because the Governor of Bombay, notwithstanding the traditional British reluctance to interfere in such matters, especially at the present time, refused his sanction to a decision so outrageous.

This incident is mentioned here not so much on account of the sensation it made throughout India, nor by reason of its excellent effects in uniting Christians of all denominations as perhaps never before; its significance is in the light it throws on the problem facing the Christian approach to India.

A conference held last year of the Metropolitans of India had before it as a principal item the question of fundamental policy in our schools and colleges. Roughly it may be said there are two schools of thought among missionaries, whose views may be of interest in the light of problems in England not dissimilar. One view sees

our schools as directed to the education of *Catholic* children ; the presence of non-Catholics, whether Christian or not, is accidental even if the Catholics are greatly outnumbered. The presence of non-Catholics is practically an economic necessity ; the fees paid by them are the condition of higher education for the Catholics. On this view the problem created by opposition is lessened, for the non-Christians of the institution are simply numbered amongst the many for whom the preaching of the Christian message is for the moment not expedient. The other view emphasises the essentially missionary character of the Catholic Church, especially in a missionary country. There is room for both views, and it is difficult to know what more can be done in practice at the present moment than to place all possible safeguards against spiritual loss to Catholics from this inevitable diminution of Catholic atmosphere. It is worth noting, too, that the mingling of Catholic with non-Catholic is not without notable advantages : the training of the Catholic corresponds from the beginning to his destiny which is to spend his life as one of a very small Catholic minority ; he combines with the advantage of some Catholic atmosphere a certain training in resistance—is it not some such advantage one observes in the Catholics of Lancashire, Holland or parts of America, where your Catholic has enjoyed the benefits of a strong corporate Catholic life combined with a necessity for a healthy reaction against the hostile or unhelpful element ?

The European Catholic may find interest and some profit in other factors too which add to the difficulty of the missionary in India. These are fairly typically summed up by Ghandi, something as follows :—all religions are true as representing the maximum of truth which a particular set of individuals has been able to attain in given circumstances ; an exclusive claim to more truth than that has no justification ; moreover, in a country like India where there are so many religions, the claim is bound to seem arrogant and to become a source of discord ; there may be an occasional and rare case of conversion from one religion to another arising out of pure conviction untrammelled by any mundane consideration ; highly undesirable are “ mass conversions,” partly because these rest so much upon the herd instinct, partly because inducements are given such as the Christian missionary holds out to the “ Untouchable ”—higher status, education of his children, medical and social benefits, etc. Others have underlined this point of Ghandi’s, and insist on the right and duty of Hindu organizations to recapture the masses converted to Christianity. There is now much the same tendency to oppose Christian progress among the Untouchables and caste-less masses generally as there was formally to individual conversions ; this is the age of democracy, and even the man who has no soul is going to have a vote.

What then of the future? India is the last country in the world about which to grow prophetic. One can only record one's own impressions based on contacts with men and books. It seems to me that the Indian Christian, left to himself as he ought to be, and is probably going to be, is in for a bad time, perhaps a very bad time indeed. Nobody of course "persecutes" nowadays, even in Germany or Russia, but there are ways of favouring some people at the expense of others, which are mightily unpleasant. The profound distrust between the major communities, chiefly Hindus and Moslem, arises largely from the conviction of each that the other is simply not trustworthy; it will take a very long time indeed, to eradicate the tendency to reserve all the plums for one's own family or caste or community. The Christian community is a very small one, very divided, unevenly distributed—there are more people in India than there are Catholics in the whole world, and only three millions in India are Catholics. I hope that I am wrong, but the immediate outlook does not seem to me bright.

On the longer view, however, I believe that Christianity may have a great future in India. It is, as we have already hinted, the challenge that makes the soldier, most of all the Christian soldier. It was proper and inevitable that Indian Christianity should be built very largely on European resources of human lives and hard-earned money. A time must come when independence will bring with it duties as well as rights for the Christians of India; nothing is more healthy than the spirit of independence rightly understood. The reproach must be removed that Christianity in India is not only of Western origin, but a Western thing in its very composition, in its essence.

There is a serious lesson to be learnt from what perhaps may be called, not unfairly, Catholic complacency. Quite recently, to take a case by analogy from another continent, I have heard a missionary stress the fact that ten converts to Mohammedanism are being made in Africa for every one to Christianity; he also had facts and figures to show that Protestants were making far more progress among Mohammedans than we are. He had some very plain questions to ask about the causes of these things. He certainly did not believe that we had made a serious and radical attempt to adapt the Christian message to a native framework, to sift the essential from the accidental.

The sympathy needed now for the foreign missions is, as always, in the form of prayer, personal and material aid. The prayer, like all prayer, must be the raising of mind and heart to God, of a heart inflamed by an immense need, of a mind thoroughly informed and conscious of a glorious feast, not only to be shared but also to be adapted to other and very different appetites.

T. D. ROBERTS, S.J., *Archbishop of Bombay.*



# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### A CHARACTER OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

EDITORIAL NOTE.—The following article reached us recently from France. The author is an English nun at the Couvent de Monthorin in the department of Ille-de-Vilaine, which is itself the setting for the article.

THE biographer of the Marquis de la Rouërie describes him as a fanatical royalist, a faithful friend, throwing his purse to the winds, his heart to women, his life to all. He knew how to inspire others with his own chivalrous enthusiasm, audacity, tenacity of purpose, and scorn of death, carried even to folly for he rushed into the most serious enterprises with incredible recklessness. As with many another, his character was to prove the index to his destiny.

Armand Charles Tuffin de la Rouërie, to give him his full name, was born at Fougères, Ille-et-Vilaine, on April 14th, 1750. Still a child when he lost his father, and brought up by a pretty and frivolous mother, he received an education more brilliant than solid, and when seventeen years old he entered the French Guards. The uncle under whose guardianship he had been placed was scarcely qualified from the point of view of influence or example to turn his nephew's generous ardour into the right direction.

After a romantic adventure in which the uncle was likewise involved, the young officer hastily quitted Paris to flee into Brittany, and without making any halt on his way presented himself at a Trappist monastery with the intention of remaining there for the rest of his life.

"Doubtless, my brother, God is seeking you," said the Father in charge of the monastery.

"No," responded the aspirant with engaging candour, "it is men who are in search of me."

A few days later it so happened that the uncle, having gone out hunting from his Breton château, encountered the monks who were working in the fields, and he went up to one of them to enquire his way. To his stupefaction, he recognised under the novice's capuchon, the face of his nephew whom he succeeded in taking back with him to Paris.

Then followed a series of quarrels, debts and duels. After a certain duel in which, as it was first supposed, La Rouërie had mortally wounded his opponent, a kinsman of Louis XVI—the King threatened to hang the turbulent youth—he was again constrained to make his escape, this time to Geneva. From there he threw up his commission as an officer in the French Guards, and being resolved to repair his youthful disorders by some brilliant action in a noble cause, he bade farewell to his mother and, accompanied by three servants, embarked for America to offer his services to fight in the War of Independence then being waged. This was in the year 1777.

Adventures were not long wanting. Before the end of the two months' voyage across the Atlantic, the vessel was attacked by an English frigate,

<sup>1</sup> *Le Marquis de la Rouërie et la Conjuration Bretonne.* By G. Lenotre. Published in 1899.

half the crew were killed, the ship took fire, most of the cargo was lost, and La Rouërie and his three men landed on American shores with nothing except what they had upon them. Various obstacles and misunderstandings were overcome, and he obtained from General Washington the authorisation to levy a battalion and to recruit volunteers, and he soon became, under the title of Colonel Armand, as popular as La Fayette himself.

The war ended, the man who had been the first of the French nobility to come was the last to leave, for he remained as long as there appeared to be any service he could render.

"I have served, and I wish to serve all my life," was his disinterested boast.

Chateaubriand's portrait of him in *Mémoires d'Outre-tombe* after La Rouërie's return to France in 1783, may find a place here.

I met at Fougères the Marquis de la Rouërie who distinguished himself in the American War of Independence. Rival of La Fayette and Lauzun, and predecessor of de la Rochejaquelein, the Marquis de la Rouërie had more wit (*esprit*) than they had. He foraged the woods in Brittany on horseback with an American Major and accompanied by a monkey riding behind him. The law students of Rennes loved him on account of his boldness of action and originality of ideas.

The next outstanding event in La Rouërie's career was his vain attempt to obtain an audience with the King when, in 1788, he was one of the twelve gentlemen chosen to bear to Versailles the representations of the Breton nobles. The matter ended in their threat to tell their people of the King's refusal, if an audience was not granted them within a specified date. After a grand supper given to many of their compatriots in Paris, they were invited in the small hours of the morning, before they separated, to adjourn to the Bastille, where they underwent what was far from being a hard captivity for several weeks. Among other ameliorations, a billiard table was hired for "the amusement of the Breton gentlemen."

Yet the King had no more loyal subject than La Rouërie whose whole-hearted allegiance reached its pitch when the members of the Royal Family were arrested in their flight to Varennes and made prisoners of the Revolution.

Meanwhile the Revolution had aroused more discontent in Brittany than in any other part of France. It was not so much the overthrow of the ancient régime, which had admitted of many social wrongs and evils, that exasperated the Bretons as the fact of the very foundation of all they held dear being shattered and outraged. They saw their priests, of whom the greater number had refused to take the revolutionary oath, driven out from their parishes and, tracked like beasts of prey by their fierce persecutors, forced to take hiding in the forests whence at nightfall, under cover of the darkness, they continued to carry on their ministry, many dying from destitution and exposure.

Events were marching rapidly towards a climax and called for strong action. La Rouërie conceived the bold scheme of arming the peasants and organising a powerful Counter-Revolution to be known as the *Association Bretonne*.

In March, 1792, he received a commission from the Princes, the King's brothers, investing him with the supreme command of the Counter-Revolutionary forces, not only in Brittany but also in the neighbouring provinces. He counted on 10,000 men responding at the first

signal to the call to take up arms—men vowed to deliver the King, disperse the *Assemblée*, and bring the Jacobins, those exalted democrats, to reason.

Having gathered together the chief adherents of the Cause, La Rouërie held a great meeting in his château of Saint-Ouen, on the night of May 27th, to make the final preparatives and distribute the posts of command.

"There is not one of us," he declared in an epoch-marking address, "whom the crimes and disorders of the Revolution have not penetrated with horror. . . . In restoring to the Church her true pastors, in protecting the influence and dignity of your holy religion . . . you will hasten the return of the Breton Constitution. . . . For myself, my brave friends, this is a glorious moment in my life. In identifying my principles, my honour, my hopes and my dangers with yours, I promise God and my country, in your name and mine, to serve my King at the cost of my fortune and my life. Let us swear to devote ourselves unreservedly to so noble a cause, and let our friends know that in this weakest part of the France we inhabit there is an irresistible force composed of men worthy to be held in honour by the whole world. . . ."

Despite all the precautions and secrecy observed, so gigantic a plot did not escape the attention of the administrators of the department of *Ille-et-Vilaine*, and troops were sent two days later to arrest the leaders of the confederacy. Warned in time, La Rouërie made good his escape with his aides-de-camp, having taken care that no compromising documents should be discovered. It was likewise for strategical motives that he abandoned Saint-Ouen and sought other headquarters.

At the end of that same month of May, it was as "Monsieur Milet," a merchant of Bordeaux, that the outlawed Marquis took up his sojourn, in order to further mature his plans, with the Chevalier de Farcy de Villiers then living in the Château of Launay-Villiers (now in the department of *Mayenne*) with his sister and nieces. One of the latter, at that time a girl of sixteen, recounted in her old age her lively personal reminiscences of those three months.

"What a pleasure to take part in so romantic an adventure and to be initiated in such a secret!" she wrote. "I remember how proud I was and what useless precautions I took to give myself an air of importance. If we had been watched, my air of mystery would assuredly have betrayed us, but as everyone was in the secret my indiscreet precautions were only ridiculous. M. de la Rouërie was lodged in a large apartment near the salon of which the door remained closed and as the shutters were never opened on that side of the house, entirely given up to him, it appeared to be uninhabited. Every night, messengers or officers of his army arrived. . . . It may be imagined how full of charm this stirring and varied life was for me, and with what curiosity I used to go down to breakfast, sure of finding new-comers. All this absorbed my attention more than the great cause itself to which however I was not a stranger. . . . M. de la Rouërie gave me various papers to copy. I only recall one; it concerned what was to be done at Fougères where the General was to go at night with his men. All these details appeared to me so novel, so chivalrous.

The Marquis was known only to the family, and in order not to arouse suspicion we continued to receive ordinary visitors. When these came only to dinner, our guests remained in seclusion, but if it was for a visit of several days, the Marquis appeared under the title

of M. Milet, a merchant from Bordeaux, compromised in an affair of the Revolution.

We had staying with us for eight days, Mme. de Montigny who greatly embarrassed us. She was vastly interested in M. Milet and made him relate how he had been compromised, without noticing that he never spoke of his adventure in the same manner, as he invented a fresh version each time. I remember a scene which much amused me. One day M. de la Rouërie brought in some flowers from the garden, asked for some thread, and sitting down at a table began making up bouquets. Mme. de Montigny who was watching him said :

‘Try as you will, you’ll never succeed in being as clever as M. de la Rouërie. Did you ever hear about that madman when you were in Bordeaux? Just imagine! he paid a flower-girl a high price to teach him how to make bouquets. It was he who went to shut himself up in La Trappe, and came out at the end of a few days to go to fight in America. All that gave great annoyance to his grandfather who was a brave admiral.’

‘Admiral!’ exclaimed M. de la Rouërie. ‘I assure you, Madame, that my grandfather—’

‘But who is talking about your grandfather?’ said the lady laughing. ‘Your grandfather was not M. de la Belinaye and, fortunately for you, you are not M. de la Rouërie, the hottest-headed man in all Brittany, who is now mixing himself up in some affair which obliges him to remain hidden. I cannot imagine how anyone can place confidence in him.’”

The manuscript in question ends here, but another member of the family has left it on record how one day, when the Marquis was quietly breakfasting in his room, two national guards suddenly and unannounced entered the corridor. La Rouërie’s first impulse was to escape by a glass door, but finding himself trapped he had just seized a knife, resolved to sell his life as dearly as possible, when he recognized in these pretended “patriots” two of his friends who had thus disguised themselves in order to gain access to him.

That month of September, four months after the inauguration of the Confederacy, witnessed the abolition of the Monarchy and the proclamation of the Republic. Consequent happenings seemed to point to the advisability of postponing the date of a general uprising until the following spring. Meanwhile “Colonel Armand”—for he had reassumed the title under which he had fought in America—scoured the country for the further enrolment of his army, in view of a widespread and simultaneous taking up of arms when the moment should be ripe. During this period, his hairbreadth escapes, the manner in which he baffled pursuit, his courage and endurance in the face of dangers and hardships innumerable, above all the rumours of his mysterious apparition in the midst of the thickest and hottest of the frequent skirmishes which intervened when, after issuing the word of command and achieving valorous deeds he became as mysteriously lost to view, gained him an almost legendary renown. His hopes were ever fostered by the vision of his “triumphant entry into Paris at the head of an army of long-haired peasants with leathern gaiters, bearing scythes upon their shoulders and singing the grand old Breton songs.”

At the end of that same momentous year of 1792, La Rouërie, savagely outlawed and closely beset by foes bent on his captivity, found himself compelled to change his place of refuge each night, often beneath no other shelter than that afforded by rocks and trees.



Among his truest friends and warmest partisans was M. de la Guyomaraïs whose house was always open to him, but La Rouërie was loath to accept the hospitality so generously offered, knowing that thereby his hosts were risking their liberty and life. At last one winter night he rode into the courtyard of the château accompanied by his secretary and servant. He was covered with mud and there was a livid scar on his forehead, for his jaded horse had rolled over with him.

The Marquis, at the height of a burning fever, was put to bed and carefully tended. After a short delay, the warning came that the "Patriots" were on his track. There was nothing to be done but wrap him up in blankets, hoist him on horseback and hurry him off to the nearest farm. The farmer, who only knew him to be a person of distinction, hid the fugitive in his own *lit-clos*—the high cupboard-like Breton bed with its one small opening at the side.

Presently the soldiers who were seeking La Rouërie called at the farmhouse to refresh themselves before making an expedition to a certain château in the neighbourhood where he was known to have been occasionally harboured.

With admirable presence of mind, the good woman of the house, seeing her place invaded by men-at-arms, knelt up on the *bank-tossel* (or bench set against the closed bed by which to get into it) in such a manner as to hide the shuttered opening, and began busily saying her rosary, after whispering a few words of warning to the almost suffocated occupant of the bed, thus deprived of air and light.

"Go into the kitchen," she bade the men who were clamouring for cider and a fire to light their pipes; "there you will find my daughter. I cannot leave my poor brother Jacques who is at the point of death."

The soldiers having at length taken their departure, La Rouërie was carried back to the château in the same manner as that in which he had been brought. He had not yet totally recovered from his fever when the terrible tidings reached La Guyomaraïs that the King's head had fallen beneath the guillotine on January 21st. None dared tell the sick man who presently began to suspect that he was being kept in the dark on some matter of importance. Sending his servant out of the room on some pretext, he rose from his bed and secured the copy of the gazette from which the man had been reading aloud to him carefully marked passages only.

A heart-rending cry brought the household to La Rouërie's side. He was wildly demanding his clothes, his horse, his arms, imagining in an access of brain fever that the King was calling him to his aid. After two days' agony, the faithful royalist died at half-past four in an afternoon of January, 1793, and his body was hastily buried in the park that same night.

Less than a month following this nocturnal burial, his grave was discovered by means of the intrigues of Lallygand, one of the villains of the piece—the other being the hypocritical Chévetel who, playing upon the affectionate esteem in which La Rouërie held him almost to the end, still betrayed his confidence.

It was Lallygand who made a raid on the château of La Guyomaraïs with some thirty of the national guard and claimed admittance in the name of the law.

At length entering the salon, the traitor accosted Mme. de la Guyomaraïs.

"Citoyenne, our mission is ended. Do you persist in denying that the *soi-disant* Marquis de la Rouërie found harbourage in your house?"

And whilst she hesitated for a moment, a ghastly object, covered with earth and blood, was flung through the window and rolled to her feet.

"There is no need of denial," exclaimed her husband indignantly. "Behold the head of a man who has long made you tremble. And you, Sir, are a base coward and your action is monstrous."

M. and Mme de la Guyomarais, destined to die upon the scaffold, were arrested and led away to Paris with their sons and all the members of the household, with the exception of the two young daughters of the house left alone in the deserted and pillaged mansion.

The Breton Association virtually ended with the death of the royalist chief of the movement, or rather it merged into the Vendéen insurrection and the Breton Chouannerie. Of the latter it has been remarked that if "Jean Chouan" was the god-father, La Rouërie was truly its father. The Counter-Revolution long remained a thorn in the side of the Republic.

Over the grave of the gallant gentleman who, according to the words he had pronounced at the gathering in his château of Saint-Ouen, had served his King at the cost of his life, was raised an iron cross bearing the ermines of Brittany and the lilies of France, together with the inscription:

MARQUIS DE LA ROUËRIE

30 JANVIER, 1793

*Le mal qui l'emporta fut sa fidélité*

MARY ST. THOMAS.

## *The Return of St. Joan*

Joan, come back to your tortured land  
(Through half a thousand years she's riding !)  
With your warrior soul and your warrior hand  
Call once more your warrior band.  
(Across half France I hear her riding !)

The lilies of France are in the dust  
(They fade and fall, are forever falling !)  
In your delicate fingers lies a trust—  
Gather their dying stems you must—  
Do you hear them Joan ? Do you hear them falling ?

The lilies of France that once were gold  
(Gold and azure see them gleaming !)  
Now hidden beneath a tricolour fold  
Are Freedom's lilies for France still bold  
A flaming glory behind you streaming ! . . .

She comes ! She comes ! To her voices true,  
(Across five hundred years comes riding !)  
With her small white face and her surcoat blue—  
The crimson of martyrdom shining through—  
She calls the knights of France from their hiding . . .  
*France will be saved, her Saint comes riding.*

MARY WINTER WERE.

## II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

- AD ASTRA** : September, 1945. [Another copy of the excellent magazine published by Group Captain the Rev. H. J. R. Ulyatt, for Catholic members of the R.A.F. serving in India. Bright and snappy articles, reports of the activities of Catholic groups, letters and answers to questions, with some drawings and photographs, make an admirable ensemble.]
- AMERICA** : August 18th, 1945. **The Future of Catholic Missions in China**, by Rev. Thaddeus Yang, O.S.B. [A native Chinese Benedictine emphasises, for American readers, the threat of Communism to Chinese integrity but thinks that, under a National China, prospects for the Church are distinctly favourable ; but the needs, particularly in education, are very great.]
- BLACKFRIARS** : September, 1945. **The Heroic Century**, by Kenelm Foster, O.P. [An interesting review of an interesting book on an interesting century : the century is the seventeenth ; the book, by the Swiss author, Gonzague de Reynold, published in 1944.]
- BROTÉRIA** : June, 1945. **Almas que Regressam**, by Domingos Mauricio, S.J. [The Editor of *Broteria* examines the evidence for conversions to the Catholic Church in Britain, America and Germany, illustrating his remarks with extracts from British and German Catholic writers.]
- CATHOLIC HERALD** : September 7th, 1945. **Spanish Primate's Pastoral**. [The full text of the Pastoral Letter, issued recently by the Archbishop of Toledo, in which he reviewed the recent history of Spain and Spain's position during the war, explaining the attitude of the Church and making suggestions for the political future of his country.]
- CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW** : July, 1945. **American Contributions to the Catholic Missionary Effort in China in the Twentieth Century**, by Rev. Joseph T. Ryan. [A study of the rapid development of Catholic missionary work from the U.S.A. In 1918 there was a mere handful of such missionaries ; by 1943 their number was 2,896. Of this number, China had the largest share, i.e., 635.]
- DOWNSIDE REVIEW** : July, 1945. **Malta and the Siege of 1940-42**, by A. H. Armstrong. [The author who was in Malta from 1939 to 1942 gives a vivid picture of the people of the island, their characters and habits and lives, and assesses the influence of the Church in personal and public affairs.]
- IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD** : September, 1945. **Dr. Russell and Newman's Conversion**, by Rev. Henry Tristram, Cong. Orat. [Fr. Tristram reviews the contacts between the Cardinal and Dr. Russell, a Maynooth professor—contacts which began in controversy and ended in considerable influence ; Dr. Russell's memory "will remain forever dear to all who venerate the great name of Newman."]
- RAZÓN Y FE** : July-August, 1945. **De Oxford a Roma : En el Centenario de la Conversion de Newman**, by Antonio Alvarez de Linera. [A Spanish appreciation of the great Cardinal convert, with a sympathetic study of his gradual progress to the true Church.]
- WESTMINSTER CATHEDRAL CHRONICLE** : September, 1945. **Homage to Newman : 1845-1945**. [A series of essays to commemorate the Newman Centenary, in a number admirably produced and provided with good illustrations.]

# REVIEWS

## THE FRUITS OF ENEMY OCCUPATION<sup>1</sup>

THE energetic Abbé Robert Kothén was well known in Catholic circles in this country long before the war. During the German occupation of Belgium we had all wondered how he was faring, and how the *Jociste* movement which he led as second-in-command to Canon Cardijn was standing up to the rigours of occupation and espionage. With the Liberation in September, 1944, news began to filter through in a growing stream. Thanks to the reports of Harry Tolfree of our own Young Christian Workers' movement, some of that news got into the Catholic Press. We heard how the Belgian *Jociste* leaders had managed to evade capture, how they had dispersed their stalwarts to key-positions in Belgium and France, and how the clandestine *Jociste* press had continued to function. But now, with the post fully restored, we can have at last the fruits of his enforced leisure-hours during these years. And it is a monumental record. This remarkable priest has produced no fewer than five substantial books during the past year, of which the three listed above are the chief. He has also finished a "History of the Catholic Social Movement," and has in the press a book on "Socialism and Communism." Copies of both these will reach us in due course. Nothing seems to hold up his output, save the difficulty in getting, from England hitherto, the main British works that he needed to complete his researches. And now that copies of his new book are arriving, it seems clear that they are so authoritative, and fill so many gaps, as to need immediate translation for purposes of English editions.

**Les Écoles Sociologiques** is a reference-book for students of the social sciences. It surveys all the main schools of thought during the last few centuries; draws out their main survival values; briefly sketches the work of their chief exponents; and relates them critically to other schools.

**Les Théories Économiques Contemporaines**, likewise, is for students. It falls into two parts. The first, occupying a quarter of the book, traces the development of industrial life as a unique characteristic of the modern world, through the medium of the economic theories that have punctuated its career: theories of "machinism," Fordism, the scientific organisation of labour, Soviet Stakhanovism, Technocracy. The second part (the remainder of the book) analyses the successive doctrines in pure economics and finance, in their bearing on production, consumption, value, currency, credit, taxation, wages, property. The book ends with a pregnant section *Vers une Économie Humaine*, rooted in the pronouncements of the Holy See.

**Principes d'Éducation Populaire**, by contrast, is the substance of Father Kothén's own courses with the Catholic School of Social Service at Brussels, and the *École Supérieure pour Ouvriers Chrétiens* at Heverle, "afin que ces élèves possèdent un aide-mémoire des leçons que nous leur donnons." It is thoroughly comprehensive in scope, and crystal clear in presentation.

<sup>1</sup> (1) *Les Théories Économiques Contemporaines*. By Robert Kothén. Louvain: Em. Warny, 2 Rue Vesale. Pp. 210. 1944. (2) *Les Écoles Sociologiques*. By Robert Kothén. Louvain: Warny. Pp. 180. 1944. (3) *Principes d'Éducation Populaire*. By Robert Kothén. Gembloux: J. Duculot. Pp. 231. 1944.



Three criteria underlie the whole treatment: that popular education must be envisaged as a unity and as *Christian*; that its *adult* continuation is as vital as its juvenile preparation; and that, while the local and national details will rightly vary, the basic *principles* are universal. The twenty chapters proceed first by way of the history of popular education; then by an analysis of the essence of education—how far its function is to engender wisdom, or furnish a technique; then by assessing the instruments of education—geography, the family, the school, work, social environment and so on; and finally by considering the place of morality, the teacher, and the Church in the education process.

We have nothing quite like any of these three books in the output of English Catholics during the present generation. The third of them, in particular, would have a wide public over here if an English edition were produced.

A.C.F.B.

#### A REALISTIC PHILOSOPHY<sup>1</sup>

SCHOLASTIC writers, who, understandably, display a peculiar horror of any theory of knowledge which smacks of Kantianism, have welcomed the realist movement in epistemology. Provided that crudity and a certain over-naïveté are avoided, this movement is a healthy symptom, so far as epistemology is concerned; but realist theories of knowledge, outside the Scholastic fold, are sometimes (but not always) united with a tendency to "naturalism," the dethronement of the subject from the position it occupies in idealist philosophies being accompanied by what almost amounts to a denial of the qualitative superiority of spiritual personality over the material object of knowledge. In view of this fact Dr. Reinhardt does well to insist, in his *A Realistic Philosophy*, that a philosophy which takes account only of some aspects of reality and loses sight of the whole can be no more than a false "realism." So-called practical men may profess to despise philosophy, but, if a man is to give his life any settled direction at all and is not content merely to drift, he must have some *Weltanschauung*, some philosophy, and Dr. Reinhardt pleads "for a return to a total view of reality, which includes in particular a total view of man and society."

Such an integral view of reality is provided by the Thomistic (the word is not to be taken in its narrowest sense) synthesis, and in his book Dr. Reinhardt, who is professor of Germanic languages at Stanford University, outlines the principles of the perennial philosophy and applies those principles to man and society, showing that they lie at the basis of a truly human life and culture and that philosophy, rightly understood, is an eminently practical science as well as a theoretical discipline. One certainly could not admit (with the cruder Pragmatism) that the truth of a doctrine rests simply on its value for practice, but one can admit that a true philosophy will not have humanly injurious effects in its application to practice and, conversely, that a theory which has evil practical effects is thereby discredited: to that extent one could allow the Pragmatist use of the Scriptural text, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Professor Reinhardt is, of course, no Pragmatist; but he is fully justified in insisting on the intimate connection between theoretical principles and the field of practice (as has M. Maritain), and his book is to be particularly recom-

<sup>1</sup> *A Realistic Philosophy*. By K. F. Reinhardt, Ph.D. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company. Pp. xii, 268. Price, \$2.75. 1944.

mended for the chapters dealing with politics and economics. Incidentally, the reviewer rejoices to see that the author does not allow opposition to Totalitarianism to lead him into the opposite extreme of political philosophy. St. Thomas certainly implies that the State has a positive function in promoting the temporal welfare of the people: opposition to State-worship does not mean that we have to be disciples of Herbert Spencer or of the policy of *laissez-faire*.

Having made it clear that those who are interested in serious reading and in the fundamental problem of human welfare could only benefit by meditating on Dr. Reinhardt's work, I should like to make two criticisms of the more metaphysical portions of the book. The author begins his exposition of the realistic philosophy with a consideration of the Concept of Being and passes on to the Attributes of Being and the Categories; but, though this procedure is often followed, I cannot see that it is desirable, especially if one takes into account the educated reader who is as yet unacquainted with theoretical philosophy. If one proposed to deduce the system of reality from the concept of Being, then one would naturally have to start with that concept; but no scholastic philosopher would propose such a deduction. Why not then, start "nearer home" and leave the highest generalisations till later? My second criticism is one which could be levelled against other books besides that of Dr. Reinhardt. Some modern Scholastics make great play with Pope Leo XIII's famous phrase *vetera novis augere et perficere* and insist that it should not be taken to imply a mere mechanical addition of new departments of knowledge to the traditional *philosophia perennis*, so that one approaches their expositions of philosophy with high hopes, only to find that the *nova* amount to little more than an acceptance of atoms and electrons and an attempt to cover contemporary physical theories with the metaphysical doctrine of hylomorphism. In saying this it is not my intention to question any part of the Scholastic system, but rather to point out how often the hopes raised by introductory references to Pope Leo's phrase are disappointed by the exposition of philosophy which follows. Sometimes (I do not mean this to apply to Dr. Reinhardt's book) one is even tempted to comment, "Why bring in the Pope's phrase at all, since it is no more than the old mixture served up again in exactly the same form?"

Perhaps this second criticism is a somewhat unfair criticism to make in regard to a book which, covering a large field of philosophical reflection, would scarcely afford scope for such work as Père Maréchal and some other thinkers have tried to do. So let me make amends by heartily recommending this book to all educated readers who wish to improve their knowledge of the "perennial philosophy" and of its tasks in the modern world. The work might well be taken as a text-book for reading and discussion in study-circles, especially as so much space is devoted to moral, political and economic themes. It is, one may add, provided with a useful Glossary, a Bibliography and an Index.

F.C.C.

#### RACIAL SUICIDE.<sup>1</sup>

IN 1940 the birth-rate in England and Wales was 14.1 per thousand, and the civilian death-rate 14.4 per thousand. (For Scotland the rates were

<sup>1</sup> (1) *Suicide Bent*. By David Goldstein, LL.D. Radio Replies Press, St. Paul, Minn., U.S.A. Pp. x, 244. Price, \$2.00. 1945. (2) *The Registrar General's Statistical Review of England and Wales for the year 1940*. Part II. H.M. Stationery Office. Pp. vi, 94. Price 1s. 6d. n. 1944.

17.1 and 14.9 per thousand.) Thus what was predicted by statistical experts for 1968 came about in 1940, owing to the number of civilian deaths in air-raids, and the birth-rate fell below the death-rate.

Dr. Goldstein's book, though it does not deal with this most recent aspect of affairs in England, collects its facts widely and arranges them well, giving not only information about population-decline in various countries but a brief history of birth-control propaganda, while quite one half of the book is devoted to argument, philosophical and religious, in condemnation of the practice. What is most surprising in his book is the evidence he produces to show the change of attitude in Soviet Russia. He prints as an appendix the edict of the Supreme Soviet, of July 8th, 1944, which introduced family allowances, gave certain privileges to expectant mothers, made divorce more difficult and four times more expensive, instituted a new decoration—the Glory of Motherhood—for mothers of seven children or more, and extended the tax on bachelors to cover those married couples who had only one or two children. It is hardly to be expected that the Royal Commission on Population should advise the adoption here in full of the Soviet law, but, if the members of the Commission examine its purpose and effects, they will do a useful service to the country. The leaders of "advanced" thought in the United States have already denounced this law as "one of the most degrading ways of trying to increase the birth-rate," and seem to hold the view that whereas lack of money may be held as a sufficient reason for not having children, the offer of money should not be allowed to operate as an inducement towards larger families.

As a convert from the Jewish faith, Dr. Goldstein is interested in the Jewish attitude to the problem, and gives much information about the traditional Jewish teaching, with its ritual aids to self-control, and contrasts this tradition with the reckless views and practices of liberalized Jewry to-day. That the decline in Jewish population is rapid may be seen from the figures he gives for Jewish children at school in Manchester. These declined from 3,787 in 1927-8 to 2,972 in 1932-3, and to 2,508 in 1935-6, with yet a further decline during the war. When a Jewish rabbi declares to an official committee in Washington that he considers birth control to be not only permissible but a divine mandate, one can well understand the loudly-voiced concern of American Jewry for "Jewish survival in the democracy of the future"—a concern which brought to light, among other things, the fact that "in Palestine, the Jewish birth-rate declined from 35.1 per thousand in the period 1922-6 to 20.1 per thousand in 1941"; the Arab birth-rate there fell during the same period from 51.2 to 49.3 per thousand, and remains the highest recorded rate in the world. It appears also that, "among the Jews the general average was brought down by the European immigrants to Palestine, who on the average had but one child in every family while the Arab family averaged four." The bearing of this on the future of Palestine is obvious.

When the attempt is made to probe beneath the facts attested by the crude birth-rate and to study trends of population, much more extensive material is to-day available for England owing to the fact that, since 1938, it has become an obligation to state at the registration of a birth the number of years that have elapsed since marriage. Thus, one can work out the various indices of reproduction, and discover, for instance, that in 1940 there were 16,833 married women under 20 who had had their first maternity in the first year of married life while only 2,780 of that same age group had their first maternity in the second year of marriage. In contrast, the

25-29 age group gives 21,463 for the first year, and 26,161 for the second year of marriage. Seeing that 109,584 women of the 25-29 age group were married in 1940, one can gain some idea of the proportion of these marriages that were still childless in 1942, and so on. The work of seizing upon the important factors in these vital statistics is not an easy one, and one could wish that, in Dr. Goldstein's book, more attention had been paid to such data as these, in so far as they are available, and less to random selections of opinion from the press of the world. At the same time, his work is well above the level of those scrutinies carried out by house-to-house enquiries, which tell us generally more about the manners of the average housewife than about her personal attitude towards these vital problems of human life.

After the analysis of population statistics comes the assignment of the causes for the decline. Here Dr. Goldstein is apt to insist on contraception alone. He does not pay much attention to the possible involuntary decline in human fertility or to such factors as the work that women do. However, it is still to be observed that, in mining districts in Britain, where the women-folk are less likely to go out to work, there is a higher crude birth-rate. (For 1940, one might compare rates of 19.1 at Bolsover or 18.4 at Wath-upon-Deane with the rates of 12.5 at Huddersfield and 13.9 in Rugby.) There is also the incidence of extended education which complicates the problem. When children remained at school only till their tenth year, they were of more obvious economic value to their parents, who could support the cost of their upkeep for so long, hoping for the return that would soon be made in the form of earnings. When, as now, the period of education is lengthened, it becomes less likely—without some form of family allowances—that the child of poor parents will be welcomed as a "consumer" for the first sixteen years of his life, especially as at the end of his school period he will be almost ready to emancipate himself from parental control.

The influence of Catholic belief and practice on the birth-rate is hardly to be expected to appear in England and Wales with the prominence it shows in Canada. But it is none the less worthy of remark that Bootle, with a rate of 22.5, Widnes, with a rate of 23.8, and Jarrow, with 19.4, are among the highest recorded, and that all these towns have a large Catholic population.

Whatever be the shape of the new Jerusalem which the planners are going to construct for us, it does not appear likely that its streets will echo with children's laughter, but rather with the protests of unoccupied teachers and toy-makers shouting for employment.

J. H. C.

#### TWO PAMPHLETS ON AUSTRIA.<sup>1</sup>

THE problem of Austria is very much to the fore at present, and it is being realized that the old Austria, prior to 1918, fulfilled a function in East-Central and South-Eastern Europe which has remained unfulfilled for the past twenty-five years. Whatever its faults—and they were venial in comparison with the faults of its two neighbouring empires—the Habsburg Empire was a rallying point for many peoples, of differing speech and sentiment. The rapid growth of national feeling helped to break that empire but the peoples who were part of it have never been really happy since, either politically or economically.

<sup>1</sup> (1) *The Problem of Austria*. By E. J. Passant. Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs. No. 72. Pp. 40. Price 6d. n. (2) *Austria*. By "Pannonius." Sword of the Spirit International Problems Series. No. 4. Pp. 48. Price, 9d. n. 1945.



The first of these two pamphlets is factual and, except on one or two vital points, reasonably objective. There is a short outline of Austrian history. The author emphasises the spirit of local independence in the different Austrian provinces or *Länder*; it is a pity that he seems to forget this when he equates the terms "Socialist" and "democratic." He notes the development of a strong pan-German movement in 1882 under Georg von Schoenerer, that was later to influence Hitler; and notes also the anti-Catholic campaign associated with this movement. He admits the importance of the Christian Social party, established by Karl Lueger, and is not afraid to stress the strong Jewish element in the councils of the Social Democrats. Generally speaking, the pamphlet gives a clear account of the political and economic problems of the post-1918 Republic.

On certain points, however, Mr. Passant is misinformed and misinforming. He speaks glibly of the Corporate State of Dollfuss and Schuschnigg as a "Catholic-Fascist dictatorship," an expression that is tendentious and entirely begs the question. The Socialist administration in Vienna was not as "democratic" as he imagines. To speak of the formation of a Socialist party militia as a "democratization" of a standing army is quite absurd. This is not to say that he is altogether uncritical of the Viennese Socialists for he admits that the cost of their schemes "had to be paid for by the already impoverished middle and upper classes of the city, who were particularly affected by these heavy imposts on house property and the severe rent restrictions imposed by the Viennese municipality." But he does equate Socialism and Democracy in a manner that is misleading, to say the least. We are told, for example, that Dr. Seipel used his influence "in a conservative and anti-democratic direction," as though in a country, that was largely peasant and conservative, the two directions were contradictory. We are told that Dollfuss crushed Socialism and democracy as though again these were synonymous terms. The fact that in all the general elections between 1920 and 1933 the Austrian people returned a majority of Christian Social members over Social Democrats is a proof that in Austria "Socialism" and "democracy" were not considered the same thing, and that by the most "democratic" of tests, i.e., a free general election.

Neither is Mr. Passant very happy in his prophecies about the Church. He suggests (p. 34) that "the influence of the Church *must have been diminished* by the feeble collapse of the Austrian episcopate in 1938," and suggests that the Church's influence over the younger generation has decreased considerably. Such *a priori* arguments have little value against facts. In October, 1944, there came a long report from Left-Wing sources (it was published in the Swedish paper *Svenska Morgonbladet*) which spoke of the Church in Austria as the most outspoken enemy of the Nazis. Part of the report reads as follows:

(The Church) is waging a bitter fight against the Hitler Youth and other National-Socialist organizations. The faithful are exhorted from the pulpit to be charitable and humane and the violence and barbarity of National-Socialism are energetically condemned. The Nazi Party has forbidden the *Waffen-S.S.* and other Party organizations to attend religious services, but members of the *Wehrmacht* are allowed to do so. Soldiers who listen to the sermons of the priests are led away from National-Socialist doctrines.

One of the most fearless antagonists of Hitlerism is the Archbishop of Salzburg. Great congregations fill Salzburg Cathedral to hear this

exceptional preacher. The Archbishop's sermons have converted many who had been corrupted by National-Socialism.

The Sword of the Spirit pamphlet on Austria is better written and better produced than that of the Oxford series and on these points which we have discussed, is a good corrective to it. The author who writes anonymously is profoundly steeped in Austrian history, has a love for the Austrian people and a real appreciation of their culture.

He comments on and explains the extreme character of Viennese Socialism :

Towards the end of the war (i.e., 1918) the virtual leadership fell to Otto Bauer, who had imbibed Bolshevism while a prisoner of war in Russia and was definitely anti-national and anti-Christian. The party thereupon became committed to the full doctrines of materialist Marxism, though it preferred to call itself the "Two and a Half International" and its members were popularly known as "Austro-Marxists."

The difficulties confronting Dollfuss in 1933 are carefully analysed. To one side were the Social-Democrats who blocked any reform of the Constitution in Parliament, since for such reform a two-thirds majority was necessary, and this they could always prevent. "They formed a State within a State, and had entrenched themselves in Vienna, where the Burgomaster Seitz was ruling as virtual dictator surrounded by his own pretorian guard." To the other side were the Austrian Nazis now openly supported by the Nazi Government in Germany. In this emergency Dollfuss was forced to act and the author judges of that action in the following paragraph :

He then set out to construct a new State framework, to take the place of the existing unworkable system of government. About either his aims or his methods, there was nothing in the least "Fascist," in so far as that ambiguous term denoted dictatorship or a ruthless disregard of minority opinion. The new constitution was to be authoritarian, but without a suggestion of totalitarianism. Dollfuss's Corporate State was in no sense conceived on the Italian model, and the whole social structure was to conform to the principles of *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*. His idea was certainly to create a Christian State, which was right and proper where the overwhelming majority were Catholics but it was so designed, as to involve no sort of discrimination against anybody else. Then, as a step to producing unity, he created a super-organization, called the Patriotic Front, open to all schools of thought and all creeds on a footing of absolute equality. In spite of this, it was boycotted by Socialists and Nazis alike.

These projects for a Corporate State came to grief, finally because of Nazi pressure and the Nazi invasion, but they were never given a real chance because of bigoted opposition from the Socialist as well as the Nazi side. The pamphlet deals with the events in Vienna of February, 1934, in their due perspective and shows how a one sided journalism has distorted them.

In conclusion, the author pleads the claims of Vienna as the centre of a new peace organization. Vienna this time must be given a definite status and a firm grip on life. Doubtless these paragraphs were written before the San Francisco Conference but their conclusion still has its force :

To transplant the machinery for world peace while leaving its ghosts, from the Lake of Geneva to the bank of the Danube, would be not a serious undertaking and, by its very proximity to the most in-harmonious units of Europe, it would, or should, in itself be able to act as a magnet for drawing them into comparative equilibrium. Besides these great potentialities it would settle for once and for all the problem of Austria, and that alone would create a considerable guarantee for peace. The form that the actual government of Austria might assume would then be relatively immaterial, and a spirit of internal tolerance arise, which might otherwise be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to recapture.

J.M.

## THE VATICAN AND FASCISM.

MR. CAMILLE CIANFARRA was the Roman correspondent of the *New York Times* from 1934 until December 11th, 1941, when Mussolini declared war on the United States. He is an American citizen of Italian descent but, though born in Long Island City, he was taken to Italy when five years of age. The reason for this was his father's position in Rome, first as the correspondent of the *New York American*, and later as manager of the Roman Bureau of the United Press. Mr. Cianfarra has, therefore, the ink of journalism in his blood and—what is far more important for the serious reader—he has a real understanding of the character and culture of the people of Italy. Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne have now published in England, under the title of *The War and the Vatican*, Mr. Cianfarra's record of those interesting and fateful years, from 1934 to 1941—a story which was issued in the U.S.A. last year, under the same title in reverse, namely, *The Vatican and the War*.

Reviewing this book in the November-December MONTH for 1944, we remarked :

In sum, while there is little in the book that will be new to students of Vatican policy, as a popular survey for the general reader, it has very high value. It certainly ought to be published in this country.

The publishers have fulfilled our wish, and we are glad. For the book provides a clear, competent and very readable survey of the Italian political scene. Mr. Cianfarra himself is thoroughly anti-Fascist and is equally sure of the opposition of the two Popes and the Vatican to Fascism and its Nazi counterpart. In a foreword, written in 1943, he claimed that his journalistic work in Rome gave him the chance of being "an eyewitness" of the struggle that both Pius XI and Pius XII waged against Nazism and Fascism, when it became clear that the Axis Powers were not to be deflected from a policy of aggression aiming to enslave the free peoples of Europe.

The personal quality of the book is insisted upon, in the same foreword :

Therefore, I did not base my observations exclusively on newspaper reports or on a cold analysis of Papal speeches and decisions which could easily be misinterpreted, as it has happened with some critics of Vatican policy because of their lack of the background that one acquires only through immediate personal contact. I heard those two Pontiffs condemn time and time again the totalitarian system of government, and witnessed the birth and rapid growth of very close

<sup>1</sup> *The War and the Vatican*. By Camille Cianfarra. London : Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Pp. 344. Price, 10s. 6d. n. 1945.

co-operation between the Vatican and Washington to prevent the war, and, later, to minimize it.

Mr. Cianfarra makes no other claim for the book than that it is "the chronicling of a reporter's experiences." Judged on that modest level, it is a highly successful effort. It is readable and attractive, and written with sympathetic understanding. There is just sufficient information to give you confidence in the author and make you feel that you are being allowed an occasional peep behind the scenes. You are introduced to many of the personages of Italian life in those critical years, when the national policy was already being tilted to its ultimate and fatal decline.

Still, it is the two Popes who steal the thunder and are the leading figures in the story. Throughout the earlier chapters, we are made aware of the struggle of Pius XI against the growing threat of Nazism, the cunning piecemeal attacks on the Church in Germany, and the occasional flashing reply of Pope Pius. So we have, among other incidents, the *Kulturkampf* outburst in the *Osservatore Romano*, in 1934, the writing and dissemination of *Mit brennender Sorge*, in March, 1937, the reaction of the Holy Father to Hitler's Roman visit in 1938, and the Vatican Radio's outspoken comment on German behaviour, in 1940.

There are some obvious gaps, many of them inevitable, and maybe advisable, in a work of this kind. It would not have been good to overload the text with references to Papal documents. Mr. Cianfarra is a reporter, doing his job very competently, and leaving other writers to do their own. But it should be remarked that the book takes us only to the end of 1941, and, in the second place, that it scarcely refers to the positive suggestions for peace and reconstruction, that emanated regularly from Pius XII.

It is a pity that, as the book was reprinted here in England, the slight differences between American and English spelling were not adjusted. Unless some contrary clause existed in the contract for re-publication, it is difficult to see the reason for this omission. The English reader may be somewhat put off by words like "maneuver" (manœuvre), "issuance" (issue), "program" (programme) and the frequent use of "-or" in noun-terminations, where we would employ "-our" (e.g. harbor, color, honor), and of the single consonant in verbs, where it would here be doubled (e.g. traveled, marshaled, counseled). Mr. Cianfarra is very careful in his place names. Once or twice he goes wrong, e.g. Bydgoszcz (he has *e* instead of *o*) on page 195, and Wolfgangsee (he omits an *f* and one *g*), on page 180. He may readily be pardoned for omitting the accent on the name of the late Father General of the Society of Jesus, which name ought, of course, to read, Ledóchowski. The English edition incorporates these slight mistakes.

## THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST<sup>1</sup>

PÈRE GALTIER ON THE INCARNATION

IT would have proved inopportune to have reviewed on its appearance Father Paul Galtier's *L'Unité du Christ*. Now that normal communications with France may be expected, it should be possible for English readers to obtain the book. Besides, no passage of time since its publication would justify its being passed over without prominent notice. Fr. Galtier has already a name among us for the erudition and vitality of his writings on dogma and the history of dogmas. In Christ-

<sup>1</sup> *L'Unité du Christ*. By Paul Galtier, S.J. Paris: Beauchesne. Pp. xx, 378. 1939.



ology, in particular, his *De Incarnatione ac Redemptione* (1926) is a textbook with outstanding merits, and those who have made use of it might well expect to find something of special excellence in this new study of Christ, which is written without the handicaps that are imposed on a general textbook and is concentrated on the central mystery of Christology, the hypostatic union itself.

The subtitle of the book (*Être—Personne—Conscience*), indicates its three parts, which deal respectively with the meaning of the Church's dogma of the union of two natures in the Person of the Word, the formulation of the dogma in terms of Christian philosophy, and the resulting problem of the psychological unity of the Word Incarnate. Fr. Galtier is conscious of the sublimity of his subject: "*Aussi bien le problème est-il aussi captivant que difficile. Rien qu'à en préciser les données, on éprouve l'impression de pénétrer dans le Saint des Saints.*" But like other theologians before him, he has followed the instinct of faith to seek understanding of that which it believes, however mysterious; and we consider that his reflections and conclusions should serve to commend the Faith to those who imagine that a revealed mystery can make no appeal to the intellect.

The value of Fr. Galtier's first part lies chiefly perhaps in the economy and adequacy of his selection of ancient sources in giving the history of the Christological definitions. The choice, though restricted, suits the purpose, which is to indicate the exact meaning of the dogma as an article of faith and to show its continuity with the original faith of the Church. He therefore cites chiefly the Popes, the Leporius incident, Cassian and Cyril, John of Antioch, and the Acts of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Needless to say, he shows no sympathy with the anxiety of modern Anglican writers to make Nestorius a martyr of orthodoxy instead of a heretic—a view which he has more fully dealt with in his *De Incarnatione*. The Catholic student of that question may profitably compare, and test for himself in detail, the respective merits of his own Catholic authorities, such as Galtier, and of the now numerous writers on the other side whose work on the two Councils is currently credited with an advanced standard of scholarship. To do so will be to grow in confidence and to find exemplified what he may reasonably have surmised, viz., that it is no aid to scholarship, in matters of Christian antiquity, to labour under the effects of a centuries-old abandonment of doctrinal authority in the Church and respect for tradition.

The point is worth illustrating. In his recent *Life of St. Leo the Great*, which was duly praised in these pages for its various merits (cf. MONTH, 1941), Dr. Jalland of Oxford ventures on a translation of a passage of Leo's most famous work, the *Tomus ad Flavianum*. The Latin and his English are as follows: "*Quamvis enim in Domino Jesu Christo Dei et hominis una persona sit: aliud tamen est unde in utroque communis est contumelia, aliud unde communis est gloria.*" "For although in the Lord Jesus Christ, God and Man are one Person, nevertheless, it is not the same to say that an insult is common to both (natures), as to say that the glory is common." Those who are familiar with the *Tomus* will marvel at this translation; but might not even a schoolboy Latinist demand some justification of it? Another recent book by Dr. Sellers of Cambridge (*Two Ancient Christologies*, 1940), contains several passages which allow, without comment, as a statement of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, the words, "He who had a beginning . . . is not God." Obviously quite a Nestorian sort of remark.

But what is here translated by a personal pronominal subject is a neuter in the text, and the context is one in which Gregory has brought out the important difference, in speaking of Christ, of neuter natural words and masculine personal ones—a thing very easy to do in inflected languages like Latin and Greek. His actual remark is "That which had a beginning . . . is not God"—which is anything but Nestorian, and is in consonance with the context. Students of the Nestorian and Monophysite debates will appreciate the apparent hair-splitting. The fact remains that one who lives in the continuous stream of Catholic tradition would realise *a priori* unlikelihood that Gregory of Nazianzus should write quite like a Nestorian, whereas when the mind of an interpreter is remote from the living context of an ancient writer, his efforts at interpretation are liable to let him acquiesce even in sins against grammar. After this long digression, let it be said that Fr. Galtier himself had better beware. If any notice is taken of his book where the newer fashion of theologizing prevails, he may find himself condemned for getting the capitals wrong in transcribing some of the titles of the many modern non-Catholic books to which he refers.

Part II of the book is a long essay in scholastic theology, in which the author argues for the view of the hypostatic union which is generally connected with the names of Tiphanius, Petavius and Franzelin. He seeks its foundation in patristic thought, and argues strongly for the patronage of St. Thomas. Whatever be the reader's school of predilection or conviction, he should find this heavily-documented discussion a source of great interest and even of excitement. For the sake of the already *blasé*, in regard to the wrangles of the schools, it may be mentioned that this is not just a continuation of the debate for and against the real distinction between created essence and existence. That question being answered even in the affirmative sense, the further question of fact arises on its own and can be answered only by light arising ultimately from revelation: was, or was not, the human essence of Christ actuated by a human existence? Fr. Galtier claims, some may say that he proves, that it was. A treasury of learning is in any case presented to the reader.

The last part is modern in the fullest sense: on the problem of the psychology of the Incarnate Word. This is not the problem which is raised by many who do not accept the divinity of Christ and ask how He can have come by the persuasion that He was the Messiah of God. It is a problem for those who hold the truth about the two perfect natures in one divine Person. How can we best understand how a created mind, the human mind of Christ, could be conscious of the divinity of Him who possessed it, and could render to Him by a created act the conscious testimony "I am the Eternal Word"? How could a man be conscious that He was God? And how are the two "psychologies," divine and human, to be united in the self-consciousness of divine personality? Fr. Galtier proposes the beatific vision as the ultimate solution, but in his explanation of it there is none of the crudity of a "*deus ex machina*." If his argument is right or probable, he has incidentally provided theologians with another argument for asserting, as they do, the existence of that vision in the soul of Christ during his mortal life. Throughout this part of the book, ample notes put the reader in touch with the most notable Christological writers of the present time, Catholic and other.

After the six grim years that have passed since his book appeared,

we hope that Fr. Galtier is in a position to accept our thanks for this exceptionally able clarification of what is most important and difficult in our Faith. Much will be lost to theologians if the book remains in its war-time state of eclipse.

W.D.

---

## SHORT NOTICES

### BIOGRAPHICAL

Senator Helena Concannon has written an interesting life of **The Curé of La Courneuve** (M. H. Gill & Son : 5s. n.). The history of the Abbé Jean Edouard Lamy, who died in 1931, presents once more the problem of the presence together in France of admirable faith and piety with bitter hatred of the Church and her children. The youth of the Abbé in the Haute Marne is a good picture of the deep devotion of peasants and craftsmen and their large families to their Catholic tradition. His life as a priest, especially the many years he spent in the *Banlieue*, the "Red Belt," of Paris, gives a contrasting picture of lost traditions, and of hatred and bitterness taking their place. As Curé of Courneuve, the Abbé Lamy had a steady success in winning back his people to their Faith. Many times he is said to have been helped directly by the Angels, by St. Joseph, and above all by Our Lady, to whom he was devoted. He often made the pilgrimage to her shrine at Gray, and he established, himself, the pilgrimage to Notre Dame des Bois. The book is well worth reading, not only for its account of a saintly priest but also for the light it throws on the work of the Church for the destitute and despairing victims of a wicked economic system.

Mr. Stanley B. James gives the modest and wise title, **Becoming a Man** (John Miles : 8s. 6d. n.) to the relation of his varied activities and spiritual adventures which culminated in his becoming a Catholic. This is an excellent book, one of the best "Spiritual Aeneids" we have read. It puts beyond doubt that the author's wanderings were no mere vagabondage, as the title of his earlier autobiography, "A Spiritual Tramp," suggested, but, in the profoundest sense, a pilgrimage, in which the traveller knows himself guided by destiny and, though ignorant of his goal, knows enough of its quality to detect counterfeits and to recognize the true goal when it is reached. Mr. James's intelligence, integrity, and detachment enabled him to live richly and dangerously without ever resting in the second-rate or the substitute ; he discerned as surely the limitations as the values of each staging-camp. We read with interest that he set his course not by any desire for spiritual security or cloistered virtue, but rather by "claustrophobia" and the ideal of "growth in normality." But most interesting of all, perhaps, Mr. James's discovery of the truth was, though intellectual, not a discursive process, but intuitive. His is, in a sense, the classical case of conversion : his spiritual vision, educated and conditioned by study and love of the revelation contained in the Old Law, recognized, when confronted with it in Rome, continuity and fulfilment. And, as he puts it himself, the Christ of whom he had had elsewhere fleeting glimpses (as in his ministry at the King's Weigh House in the West End of London and at Christ Church, Wimbledon) he found, in the Church Catholic, at home.

A new sketch of the life of St. Philip Neri was needed to acquaint a new generation with the pattern of his sanctity, grown unfamiliar through dearth of books about him. **St. Phillip Neri**, by Doreen Smith (Sands & Co.: 6s. 6d. n.), is written with an eye on the modern audience, and sometimes

with both eyes, as when we are told (p. 38) that St. Philip had *detective stories* read to him as he was vesting for Mass, whereas the more sober pages of the *Life* by Pennelle and Bordet (1932) tell us that at that time St. Philip played with a pet bird or dog, or had jokes read to him by his favourite author Piovano Arlotto, whose joke book, along with the *Laudi* of Jacopone da Todi, was a principal factor in forming Philip's character. One misses the story of Philip as a young man in Rome reading Virgil by moonlight because he could not put the book down nor pay for candles, and also the incident dear to Newman, of his saluting the early students of the Venerable English College as "*flores martyrum!*" But the essential Philip is here with his drollery and fascination and his pioneering devotion to the Holy Ghost.

## THEOLOGICAL

Father Stephen J. Brown, S.J., has done a good work very well in his **Towards the Realization of God** (Browne and Nolan: 7s. 6d. n.). He begins by explaining what he means by realization. The truth about God is of vital importance to human beings. It cannot be sufficiently known if it is given intellectual assent and no more: the soul must savour the truth about God which it has from theology, making scientific truth the basis of personal admiration and love of God. The rest of the book is an excellent example of how to "study God" with both the exactness of science and the warmth of affection. Clearly, and without unnecessary use of technical terms, Father Brown sets out the manner of our thinking and speaking about God: then he develops the bare statement of the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity, the Fatherhood of God, and the Presence of God, in a way which helps the understanding and warms the heart. His suggestions are helpful for expansion of the Foundation in the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius. Throughout the book, and especially in the last chapter, there is reference to many books, from the *De Perfectionibus Moribusque Divinis* of Leonard Lessius to the most modern works, in which the study begun in Father Brown's book may be continued.

## LITERARY

**Francis Thompson: In His Paths** (Bruce Publishing Co.: \$2.75), by Father Terence L. Connolly, S.J., the author of a useful annotated edition of Thompson's poems, is a sort of "Sentimental Journey," chatty and discursive, in which Fr. Connolly records his pilgrimage from America to persons and places associated with Thompson. One meets in these pages the old-world courtesy and charming fun of Mr. Wilfrid Meynell; also Archbishop Kenealy who cared for Thompson when convalescing at the Franciscan Monastery at Pantasaph and who encouraged Fr. Connolly's work with the words: "The intellect of the world has been corrupted. Francis Thompson is the antidote." Tyburn, Charing Cross, the Victoria Embankment and Storrington prove evocative of memories and apt quotation. But perhaps Manchester provided our visitor with a memory as lasting as any; for it was there that the author wished to take a photograph; but "the light was very dim, so I turned to an old man and asked, 'Do you think the sun will come out in a little while?' 'It is out, sir,' he answered." There are some interesting extracts from the poet's notebooks, and Fr. Connolly's reference of certain of the poems to their historical context quickens their interest and freshens their message.



## DEVOTIONAL

From M. H. Gill, Dublin, comes a collection of twelve talks, originally given on Radio Eireann by Passionist Fathers during the Lents of 1943 and 1944. The general title is **If They Had Known** (price: 2s. n.). The talks are studies of characters of the Passion: Judas, Annas and Caiaphas; Herod and Pilate and Barabbas; Dismas and Simon of Cyrene; Peter, John, Mary Magdalene and Joseph of Arimathea. The reader must remember that they were composed, in the first case, as radio talks. But they do present, even when read, a vivid picture of the characters concerned. A useful short book for Passiontide.

St. Francis of Assisi possesses an appeal that has not often been equalled in the history of the saints. Yet we must not be misled by the joyousness and simplicity of his life so as to forget its stern and ascetic background. St. Francis combined a detachment and asceticism with a spirit of happiness and joy. But his was a "dour delight"; we shall miss the delight unless we study the "dourness" that lay at its heart. Father Augustine, O.F.M.Cap., gives us in **Some Loves of the Seraphic Saint** (M. H. Gill, Dublin: 7s. 6d. n.) a study of some of the focal points of Francis's devotion. Among them are crib, cross and altar. Throughout the book, the spirit of St. Francis is amply illustrated from various documents and from tradition. The book is rich with the Franciscan atmosphere—of joy in God, of trust in Divine Providence, of that simplicity of spirit, which his brethren have inherited from their seraphic founder.

An Ursuline nun has compiled a small anthology of comforting passages of prose and verse, under the heading of **Let Not Your Heart Be Troubled** (M. H. Gill, Dublin: 2s. n.). Some extracts are from Newman and Faber; the majority, however, are from less familiar sources or have been contributed by friends. They are simple passages which, so the compiler hopes, will serve to comfort the tired and troubled mind and give the reader the encouragement of a passing religious thought.

## HISTORICAL

Professor Edmond Vermeil has written several volumes on German literature and history, particularly that of the nineteenth century. In a French "Penguin," published in London, entitled **Hitler et le Christianisme**, he now gives a straightforward and very lucid account of the Nazi policy towards the Catholic Church and the various Protestant churches in Germany. With a thorough understanding of the background and familiarity with the literature of the Nazis, he is able to demonstrate very cogently that the Nazi outlook, with its essentially "religious," that is, "counter-religious" spirit, is completely incompatible with any form of Christian belief. And, as there could be no compatibility, so there can be no compromise. He writes:

Le conflit entre l'Etat nazi et le christianisme est sans issue. Il n'y a pas de compromission possible entre le nationalisme religieux allemand tel que l'affirme le IIIe Reich et une religion universelle par essence et tradition. Les termes du conflit sont parfaitement clairs, alors même que le protestantisme évangélique soit infiniment plus divisé ou vacillant en face de l'adversaire commun que le catholicisme d'outre-Rhin.

In a final chapter he studies the behaviour of German Catholics and Protestants during the war. While recognizing and giving praise to the

stand made by Christian leaders against Nazi doctrines and attacks upon the Church or churches, he is inclined to accuse them of identifying themselves too much with their fellow countrymen during the course of the war. He discusses the reasons which he puts forward, but is inclined, I think, to minimise the differences which did exist very really.

## MISCELLANEOUS

A character in one of Compton Mackenzie's novels urges as a remedy for the distressed state of the Highlands of Scotland that they should join Ireland. "This young Irish chap said that Ireland must be free soon, and that Davitt's dream was to unite Gaeldom. . . . You see, his idea was that Belfast was the national capital of the Islands, and that Glasgow was a piece of artificiality." Another "young Irish chap" has now written a book—**Counties of Contention** (Mercier Press, Cork: 7s. 6d. n.), by Benedict Kiely—on the problem of Belfast and of the "Pale" which the events of 1916-1922 have attached to it, but he does not, in the end, give us his own solution. On the last page but one he refrains, out of modesty and pride, as he says, from outlining a plan, being content to have gone through the history of the Six-County state, and to have traced it to its birth in the mind of a Cornish Liberal. He assigns due credit to the descendant of the Italian immigrant, Carsoni, for his quickness in seeing that six counties might be saved as a "Pale," whereas the nine counties of Ulster could not be, and he pursues the fantastic story down to the year, 1944. Lest this Italian reference be misunderstood, Mr. Kiely writes that Carson's father "was an architect, descended from a Carsoni who had come to Dublin from Scotland. That Carsoni had been one of those Italian architects who worked on the mansions of England and Scotland and Ireland during the eighteenth century. Somehow or other, the final vowel was dropped; Carsoni became Carson; and the official biographer in a very naïve sentence says that Edward Carson's father 'despite his Italian blood lived and died a devout Presbyterian'." Already the story has become more fantastic, since now the same men who are the Government party at Belfast are in opposition when they come to Westminster. It is almost as fantastic as the belief (quite unfounded in fact) which the soldiers of William of Orange expressed in their songs, that the Pope was on their side in the invasion of England, or the equally strange fact that, at the present time, the University at Belfast is seeking a professor of Celtic at the handsome salary of £1,200 a year and is the only University College in the United Kingdom to endow a professor of Scholastic Philosophy. Mr. Kiely notices how the coming of hard times in 1930 united, for a moment at least, the Catholic and Orange workers in protest against unjust conditions of work. It may be that the same will happen again, and that the social teaching of the Popes will find them a hearing from men who have been taught from childhood to abhor them as religious leaders. As Father Tom Finlay, S.J., once told an audience of Orange farmers (c.f. p. 107), "they were there to discuss a practical issue, and the shadow of an ancient fight between a Dutchman and a Scotsman had nothing to do with the case."

## "THE UNIVERSE"

The Leading Catholic Newspaper  
merits your support.

It has faithfully and zealously served the Catholic Cause at home and abroad during the whole period of its long history 1860-1945. Its able editorials, Notes and Comments, powerful articles and unrivalled news service place it in the front rank of newspapers.

**EVERY FRIDAY 2d**

Direct Subscriptions: 13s. Inland, or Abroad  
per year. Inclusive of postage.

Special terms for members of His Majesty's  
Forces: 10s. per year, inclusive of postage, and  
*pro rata* for 6 or 3 months.

*Head Office:*

Field House, Breams Buildings, London,  
E.C.4.

*Eighty-first thousand*

## The Difficult Commandment

By REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

"Of the many books that deal with the delicate matter of sex, whether they be hygienic, psychological, or frankly Freudian, not all are entirely satisfactory. Even the blessedly religious—or should we say pious—way of dealing with the difficulties involved is not always helpful to those who most need help. This is the sanest and most wholesome book we have seen on this subject."  
*Blackfriars.*

**Price Ninepence Net.**

## MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR YOUTH

(SIXTIETH THOUSAND)

With the approbation of the  
Archbishop of Westminster and  
of the Archbishop-Bishop of  
Southwark.

This excellent prayer book, an especial favourite in Catholic Colleges and Convent Schools, was entirely re-arranged by the late Father Joseph Keating, S.J., in consultation with various spiritual Authorities. The manual has been described as truly manly and practical, and appeals to all whose piety is sincere, simple and devout.

**Price, 3/6 net cloth boards.**

**LONDON:**

**MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.15**

## SWORD OF THE SPIRIT

*President;* MGR. BERNARD GRIFFIN,  
*Archbishop of Westminster.*

The **Sword of the Spirit** was established  
by Cardinal Hinsley in August, 1940:

To unite Catholics in an understanding of  
the spiritual issues arising from the war;

To emphasize the need for Christian  
principles in social and international  
reconstruction;

To call upon Catholics for more sincere  
**Prayer**, for more serious **Study** of the  
Church's teaching on social and public  
questions, for more energetic **Action**.

The **Sword of the Spirit** Bulletin is published  
every month. Price **4d.**

*Headquarters;—*

**24 Dorset Place, LONDON, N.W.1.**

## HAVE YOU EVER THOUGHT...

that a subscription from you to the  
C.T.S. may be the means of bringing  
the Faith to others? The demand  
for pamphlets is greater than ever  
but their production is made possible  
only by members.

Write **TODAY** for details:

## CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

38-40 ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1

## THE MONTH

(Double-Number. Two Shillings net)

EDITOR REV. JOHN MURRAY, S.J.

THE MONTH was founded in July, 1864, to represent the point of view and the claims of the Catholic Faith, and it has continued to do so for more than eighty one years. The need to fight the battles of the Church in English-speaking lands—a cause to which the periodical is wholly consecrated—was never greater, and the Editor ventures to hope that the support given to his efforts may always continue and be extended.

PUBLISHERS Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd.  
London.

Annual subscription 13s. post free (U.S.A. \$3.25), should  
be sent to the Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton,  
London, S.W.15.

REPRINTED

## Dark Symphony

By ELIZABETH LAURA ADAMS

6/-

"In the story of Elizabeth Laura Adams, the coloured girl, who wanted to fight the school bully and shocked her father; who wanted to be an actress, and a nun; who wanted to become a writer and certainly became one; some of us may learn what it really means to become a Catholic. In case it is not apparent, I would indicate to the reader . . . I am enthusiastic about *Dark Symphony*."

W. J. Igoe in *The Catholic Herald*

"*Dark Symphony* is a book that no one could read unmoved.

*Irish Press*

PLEASE ORDER FROM YOUR BOOKSELLER

**SHEED & WARD**

**110/111 FLEET STREET, E.C.4**

## ENJOYING THE NEW TESTAMENT

By **Margaret T. Monro**

*With a Foreword by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J.*

This book aims to help Catholics who, though familiar with the New Testament in selections, would like to make its acquaintance as a whole. A reading course has therefore been devised with this end in view. In order to simplify the more tedious elements of 'background,' the books are studied for the most part in the order in which they were written, with just enough of introduction to make clear why and to whom they were written.

With Map

8/6 net

**LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.**